FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-106
Friday
1 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-106 CONTENTS *1 June 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev 1 June Briefing on World Issues 1
  'Extraordinary' Arab Summit *[TASS]* 1
  Jewish Settlement Issue *[TASS]* 1
  Afghan Grand Assembly Achievements *[TASS]* 1
  Detained Japanese Fishermen *[TASS]* 1
Shevardnadze, Envoys Discuss Children's Summit *[TASS]* 2
UNSC Adopts Document on Cambodia *[TASS]* 2
Asia-Pacific Meeting in Vladivostok 4-6 Sep *[TASS]* 3
VZYGLAD Program Covers Several Issues *[Moscow TV]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to U.S. 5
  Bush Welcomes Gorbachev *[TASS]* 5
  Gorbachev Reply Speech *[Moscow TV]* 5
  Baker Previews Arms Accords *[TASS]* 6
  Gorbachev, Bush Meet Journalists *[Moscow TV]* 6
  Gorbachev Addresses Embassy Luncheon *[Moscow International]* 7
  'Substantive' Talks on Germany *[TASS]* 7
  Talks on Germany Continue *[Moscow Radio]* 7
  Gorbachev Speaks at Banquet *[TASS]* 8
  Bush Notes 'Historic' Changes *[TASS]* 8
Summit 'Developing Well' *[Prague CTK]* 9
Soviet, U.S. Spokesmen Comment on 31 May Talks *[TASS]* 9
PRAVDA Focuses on Arms Issues at Summit *[31 May]* 9
Timing of Summit Trip, Effect of Yeltsin Viewed *[Moscow International]* 11
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Previews Summit *[31 May]* 11
Further Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Canada 12
  Speech at Ottawa Luncheon *[Moscow TV]* 12
  Reception Speeches Cited *[TASS]* 14
  'New Melody' From West Urged *[Moscow TV]* 15
Petrovskiy Receives Visiting U.S. Congressman *[IZVESTIYA 27 May]* 15
Parliamentary Delegation Arrives in Canada *[TASS]* 15

Northeast Asia

REUTER Cited on No Tae-u, Gorbachev Summit *[Moscow International]* 16
Envoy to Moscow Received by Shevardnadze *[Moscow International]* 16
Reelection of DPRK's Kim Il-song Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 May]* 16
Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Congratulate DPRK Leaders *[TASS]* 16
  Ryzhkov Message to Counterpart *[IZVESTIYA 27 May]* 16
Frolov Holds Talks, News Conference in Japan *[PRAVDA 25 May]* 17
Mongolia's Gungaadorj Discusses Market Economy *[Moscow International]* 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Official Praises Cambodia Settlement Effort *[TASS]* 18

Moscow International on Burmese Elections 18
  Oleg Shchedrov Commentary 18
  Aleksandr Vladimirov Commentary 18
Nguyen Van Linh Writes on Ho Chi Minh *[PRAVDA 18 Mar]* 19

Near East & South Asia

Egypt's Mubarak Viewed as 'Prominent Leader' *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 12 May]* 21
Gorbachev Talk With India's Singh Reviewed *[Nikolayev on Moscow International]* 23
Pakistani-Backed Acts in Afghanistan Denounced *[Biryukov on TASS]* 24

East Europe

Vorobyev on Progress of Withdrawal From CSFR *[Moscow International]* 25
  Data Cited on Withdrawal *[PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 25
Landbergis' 'Private Visit' to CSFR Noted *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 25

West Europe

Thatcher Plans Official Visit 7-10 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 26
Gorbachev Congratulates Portugal's Cunhal *[TASS]* 26
French Chief of Staff Schmitt Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 May]* 26
Bundestag Decision on W. Berlin Deputies Viewed *[PRAVDA 25 May]* 27
Food Delivery Problems From FRG Explained *[IZVESTIYA 26 May]* 28

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Carries 31 May Supreme Soviet Session 29
Supreme Soviet Adopts Bill on Status of Deputies *[TASS]* 29
Debate Shows Support for Government Market Plan *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 29
Commissioner Kucherenko on Transition to Market *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 30

Political & Social

Ligachev Interviewed on Current Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 31
'More Reasonable Line' From Yeltsin Predicted *[London TV]* 35
  Yeltsin Seeks 'Productive Dialogue' *[TASS]* 36
Yeltsin Discusses European Trip, Health *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH]* 36
Vladimir Posner Discusses Current Issues *[London BBC TV]* 37
Further on Ryzhkov Automobile Accident *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 38
Gorbachev Greets 'Teachers for Peace' *[Moscow Radio]* 38
'Attack' on KGB Reception Office Denied *[TASS]* 39
CPSU Platform 'Unanimity' Concept Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 May]* 39
Moscow News Editor Views Media Issues *[MOLODEZH ESTONII 1 May]* 40
Successor to Pimen To Be Elected 7 June *[IZVESTIYA 25 May]* 44
Environment Issues Arouse Concern in Polls *[Moscow International]* 44
Nature Conservation Bill Endorsed *[TASS]* 44

Economic

Ryzhkov, Abalkin Answer Market Economy Questions *[Moscow TV]* 45
Abalkin To Participate in Market Economy Forum *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Shopping Ban on Non-Muscovites 'Might Backfire' *[TASS]* 45
'Timidity' of Market Program Deplored *[PRAVDA 26 May]* 46
Ministers Interviewed on Prices *[Moscow TV]* 48
Official Notes USSR April Economic Record *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 20]* 52

Science

Reportage on Flight of 'Kristall' Module ... 54
  Launched From Baykonur *[Moscow Radio]* ... 54
  Correspondents Report on Launch *[Moscow Radio]* ... 54
  TASS Provides Parameters ... 54
  Flight Continues Smoothly *[Moscow Radio]* ... 55

Military

Yazov Meets With Newspaper Journalists 21 May *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 May]* ... 55
Foreign Military Attaches Visit Taman Division *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 May]* ... 55
OGONEK Leads Attack Against Armed Forces *[LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA 13 Apr]* ... 56

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Discusses Meeting With Yeltsin *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 62
Landsbergis Interviewed on Arrival in Moscow *[Moscow TV]* ... 62
Report on Landsbergis' Visit to Prague *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 62
Prunskiene on Prospects for Negotiations *[Vilnius International]* ... 63
Lithuanian Compromise Move Discussed *[Moscow TV]* ... 63
Vilnius Radio Carries 31 May Supreme Council ... 64
  State Control Law Debated ... 64
  Power Supply Viewed ... 64
  State Control Law Adopted ... 65
'Critical' Power Supply Situation in Lithuania *[TASS]* ... 65
Commission Examines Fuel, Power Situations *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 65
Lithuanian Communique on Economic Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 66
'Soviet Lithuania' Radio Station Formed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 66
Vilniuskiy Rayon Soviet Calls for Referendum *[TRUD 27 May]* ... 66
Vilnius Radio Reports Moldavia's Recognition ... 67
Agreement Signed With Poland on Sugar, Oil *[Vilnius International]* ... 67
Latvia To Begin Rationing Foodstuffs 1 June *[AFP]* ... 67
Latvian Government Takes Over Publishing House *[TASS]* ... 68
Baltics Foreign Affairs Commssions Hold Meeting *[Vilnius International]* ... 68

RSFSR

Yeltsin, Landsbergis Discuss Possible Ties *[Moscow TV]* ... 68
Boris Isayev Elected Deputy Chairman *[TASS]* ... 68
Moscow TV Relays 31 May Congress Proceedings ... 68
  Amendments Proposed ... 68
  Deputy Chairmen Nominated ... 69
  Candidates Speak ... 70
  Speeches Continue ... 71
  Procedural Matters Debated ... 72
Yeltsin Reports Repeal of Foodstuffs Restriction *[Moscow TV]* ... 73
Congress Adopts Statement on Price Reform *[Moscow TV]* ... 73
'Clashes of Differing Views' at Congress Noted *[TASS]* ... 74
Further Congress Criticism of Yeltsin Cited *[TASS]* ... 74
Implications of Yeltsin Election Analyzed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* ... 75
Article Assesses Yeltsin Victory *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 May]* ... 76
Yeltsin Holds 30 May Moscow News Conference *[Moscow TV]* ... 76
Yeltsin Addresses Russian Komsomol Congress *[TASS]* ... 87
Moscow Party Official Assesses Plenum Results *[Moscow TV]* ... 88
Moscow Soviet Revokes Decision on Buildings *[Moscow International]* ... 88
Russian Trade Unions Reject Government Reform *[Moscow Radio]* ... 88
Vladimir Residents Protest Moscow Shopping Rules *[Moscow TV]* ... 88
  To Suspend Food Shipments *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 May]* ... 89

Report on Kamchatka Oblast Party Meeting *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 89
Yazov Addresses Khabarovsk Conference *[Khabarovsk Radio]* 89
Local Bodies of Power Elected in Maritime Kray *[Moscow Radio]* 90

Western Republics

State Commission Discusses Donbass Strike Accord *[TASS]* 90
Moldavian Supreme Soviet Recognizes Lithuania *[TASS]* 90
Moldavian Supreme Soviet Debates Ministries *[TASS]* 90
Second Quake Kills Four People in Moldavia *[TASS* 91

Perfilyev 1 June Briefing on World Issues

'Extraordinary' Arab Summit

LD3105163990 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told journalists today that it was necessary to clear obstacles to a Middle East settlement.

Commenting on the results of an extraordinary Arab summit in Baghdad, he said that the documents adopted by the Arab leaders should be studied in detail and added that the Soviet Union regarded the meeting as proving the Arab intention to respond to the challenges of the time and overcome the existing obstacles.

Perfilyev said that the tense situation in the Middle East, especially the tragic events on the occupied territories, had affected the course and the outcome of the Baghdad summit. "Today as never before it is necessary to move the Arab-Israeli settlement from the dead end."

Perfilyev also said that the message sent by President Mikhail Gorbachev to president Saddam Hussain of Iraq, as the head of a country that hosted the Baghdad summit, confirmed the Soviet Union's course towards close Soviet-Arab cooperation. The message was warmly welcomed by the summit participants.

"The Arabs again demonstrated their constructive position and spoke for a comprehensive settlement with Israel and the convocation of an international conference. It is significant that the flexible and realistic line of the PLO leadership was supported by the Arabs."

Speaking about Israel's policy of settling immigrants, including those arriving from the Soviet Union, on the occupied Arab territories, Perfilyev said: "The Soviet Union shares the Arab concern and favours the adoption of resolute measures, including on the part of the United Nations, to counteract Tel Aviv's dangerous plans. We will continue coordinating our efforts with the Arab countries and the PLO in this field."

Perfilyev also expressed hope that the decisions adopted in Baghdad on other issues would promote progress in an Iranian-Iraqi settlement, implement the al-Ta'if agreements and carry out decisions of the U.N. Security Council on the withdrawal of Israeli troops from southern Lebanon.

Jewish Settlement Issue

LD3105171190 Moscow TASS in English 1654 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The Soviet Union has repeatedly called on the Israeli Government to stop the policy and practice of building settlements on the Jordan West Bank and Gaza Strip, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

The Soviet Government urged Israel to make clear assurances that it will not use immigrants for these purposes, including those from the USSR, he said.

"Israel's remarks that the immigrants are free to choose where to live, including the occupied territories, contradict international law," Perfilyev observed.

"The settlement of Israeli citizens and immigrants on the occupied Arab lands clearly violate the 1949 Geneva Convention," he said.

Asked about the Soviet emigration and immigration practices, Perfiliyev replied that a corresponding bill is currently being examined by parliament.

Afghan Grand Assembly Achievements

LD3105191290 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 31 May 90

[Report by TASS diplomatic correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfiliyev described the recent meeting of the Afghan Loya Jirgah [Grand Assembly] as a major turning point. He emphasised that one of its main political results was an appeal of 772 delegates to all Afghan political parties, groups and leaders to abandon group and personal interests and contribute to national reconciliation and end the bloodshed in Afghanistan.

Perfilyev also said that the Loya Jirgah had supported government efforts to end the war and achieve a political settlement in the country, adopted amendments to the Afghan Constitution, instructed the Afghan leadership to continue the policy of national reconciliation and talks with the opposition and approved the mechanism of the Afghan political settlement offered by President Najibullah.

He emphasised that the promotion of national reconciliation and the upgrading of democracy in Afghanistan had led to removing the root causes of the armed confrontation in Afghanistan and the problem of Afghan refugees in other countries.

Detained Japanese Fishermen

LD3105194590 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The illegal actions of the Japanese side and the violation of bilateral fishing agreements led to the detention of Japanese fishermen on May 9 and 13, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

He said that the Soviet Foreign Ministry had delivered a protest note to the Japanese Embassy in Moscow complaining of systematic violations by the Japanese side of the intergovernmental fishing agreement. Perfilyev emphasised that despite numerous appeals and warnings of the Soviet side, Japanese fishing vessels continued crude violations of intergovernmental fishing treaties to the point that "the agreements themselves are threatened."

Soviet fishing guards have detained 13 Japanese fishing vessels with concealed names and side numbers in the second half of April and the first half of May for illegal salmon fishing in banned areas before the entry in force of bilateral agreements on the terms and rules of fishing for 1990. Besides, the vessels did not have the permission, issued by competent Japanese bodies and registered by the Soviet side, that is required under the agreement of May 12, 1985.

Perfilyev regarded the Japanese violations as inflicting millions of roubles of economic damage to the Soviet Union.

Shevardnadze, Envoys Discuss Children's Summit

LD2805173590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1652 GMT 20 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 28 May (TASS)—Today USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received the ambassadors of the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Republic of Mali, Mexico and also the charges d'affaires of Canada, Pakistan, and Sweden.

In the course of conversation, the issues of preparation for convening, at the initiative of the six above countries, a world summit in the interest of children scheduled for late September this year, were discussed.

The minister stressed that the Soviet side, actively participating with other countries in preparing the summit, will make everything necessary for ensuring success of this forum. The main task is to agree on concrete practical steps which will make it possible to really improve the situation of children in today's world

Also, the USSR foreign minister briefed his interlocutors on the importance of the USSR president's forthcoming visits to Canada and the United States.

UNSC Adopts Document on Cambodia

LD2705165490 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 27 May 90

[By TASS Correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] United Nations May 27 TASS—The five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council wound up their fourth meeting on Cambodia on Saturday evening. They adopted a final document, saying that participants analysed progress made as a result of their efforts to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Cambodian problem. The five welcomed a meeting of the Cambodian parties, scheduled for Tokyo early in June, and expressed hope that this dialogue would be kept going.

The document expresses firm conviction that a comprehensive political settlement and it alone would bring solid peace and stability to Cambodia.

The document stresses that this settlement should envisage measures to verify the withdrawal of all foreign troops and foreign military aid, to announce a ceasefire for a long term, create a supreme national council, ensure free and fair elections to a constituent assembly under the U.N. auspices, and implement basic human rights and liberties.

The guarantees of Cambodia's independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, neutrality and national unity are also needed.

Considering the great importance of cooperation between the Cambodian parties, the five invited their representatives to hold joint discussions during the next meeting of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council on Cambodia, due in Paris in the first half of July.

"Our meeting was held against the favourable backdrop," Soviet deputy foreign minister and head of the Soviet delegation, told TASS.

"States in the region, Western countries, the Cambodian parties and the Soviet Union took several steps, which helped expedite the entire process of the political settlement," Rogachev said.

"With each new meeting, our talk is acquiring a more specific nature and is becoming more sustantive. At this meeting we have discussed all aspects of the Cambodian settlement: The role of the United Nations Organisation, the operation of a U.N. administration and the functions of a supreme national council. All Cambodian parties agree today that this body should be set up for the period before national elections are conducted. The meeting also discussed international control," Rogachev said.

"The decision to invite representatives of all Cambodian parties to attend our next meeting was of great importance. We are switching to a new format of our meetings and, perhaps, to their new quality.

"The human rights issue was one of the all-important topics, which was for the first time discussed in detail at the meeting. At point are moves to prevent the recurrence of the Genocide regime, which is held responsible for mass murder.

"On the whole, the five countries have narrowed their positions on several points. The meeting should undoubtedly be evaluated positively.

"I would like specially to note the activity of the U.N. Secretariat," Rogachev said. "Three U.N. missions have visited Cambodia. They explored the state of roads and railways, ports and airfields, mapped out places for U.N. personnel residence. This is a very useful work. Further recommendations are being worked out concerning the launching of a U.N. mission in Cambodia," Rogachev said.

Asia-Pacific Meeting in Vladivostok 4-6 Sep

LD0106082190 Moscow TASS in English 1657 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The second international meeting for dialogue, peace and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region will be held in Vladivostok on September 4-6. This was announced at the Soviet Foreign Ministry today.

The meeting will be attended by politicians, businessmen and scientists from 30 Asia-Pacific countries.

They will discuss the military-political situation in the region and ways to establish regional economic cooperation.

The first international meeting for dialogue, peace and cooperation was held in 1988 and attracted the attention of the people of the region. The participants in the first Vladivostok meeting decided to make such forums regular events.

Journalists interested in covering the second Vladivostok meeting can hand in applications for accreditation to the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Directorate.

VZYGLAD Program Covers Several Issues

LD2805204890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2048 GMT on 25 May carries an edition of the 'Vzyglad,' or 'View,' program, which is 14 minutes in duration.

The program opens with a feature based on sculpture by Leontiy Ozernikov and poetry by K. Kedrov. The two satirize Stalin, Brezhnev, and other Soviet leaders. This is followed by a music video. The 'Vzyglad' presenters then introduce the edition. It begins with new clips, including an exhibition of archive material relating to the tsar's family and Stalin's repressions. Next follows a report form Chelyabinsk cancer clinic, outlining the poor conditions. Staff and patients are shown discussing the poor situation. This is followed by a feature on Moscow hard currency dealers. One is interviewed on prices and earnings.

Next follows a studio interview with Gennadiy Filshin, secretary of the Supreme Soviet Commission on Planning and Budget. Asked about price reform, he says it could have been made less painful for consumers. He outlines measures that should be taken: importation of technology, for instance. He says all economic reform variants envision price increases; these are unavoidable but should be fully compensated. He notes that everything should be carefully worked out and properly implemented.

The next items in the program are a musical cartoon, and a clip from the film "Superman." This is followed by a clip from the film "Death of a Dynasty," which concerns the 1917 execution of the tsar and his family. The film's distributor is named.

After a brief musical interlude there is a feature on Admiral Kolchak, using material recently declassified by the civil war archive. The feature is an account of his early life, his experience in the Russo-Japanese war and in World War I. It is noted that he joined the British Army and fought against the Germans, but was then dispatched to the Soviet Far East, where he became a figure of some notoriety, and was imprisoned and executed.

An interview with a historian notes that Kolchak was a great soldier, but a poor politician.

Following another musical break there is an excerpt from the film "One Cannot Live Like This," which concerns past brutality in the USSR. It emphasizes the need for repentance. People's Deputy Stankevich gives a positive review of the film.

Historian and People's Deputy Volkogonov is interviewed next in the studio on people's "crisis of faith." He says the party has suffered a great historical failure, but the party consists of living people who should make a sober denunciation of the anomalies of the past. He says he has no intention of leaving the party. He notes that Russian sovereignty is welcomed as a necessary step toward revival. He says the results of the elections for RSFSR president are expected soon.

After a music video is shown there follows an interview with a deputy editor of a video film catalogue, which lists films available within the USSR.

Next follows a report on the life an Orthodox priest. Father V. Bogdanov is interviewed about his life. This is followed by a feature on recycling cans and an interview with a medal designer.

The next item is an interview with members of the Russian Christian Democratic Movement. The party has branches in Moscow, Leningrad, (?Perm), Kostroma, Riga, Kaluga, Borisolglebsk, and other towns, totalling 12,000 members. An unidentified correspondent begins the interview, "I have several questions to ask you. First, what are the party's present aims and tasks? Second, how does the party see itself in a future Russia?" The movement's leader, Aksyuchits, replies, "The situation in the country today is so disastrous, both in the material and spiritual spheres, that society needs superior efforts to put things right. It is clear that any society is capable of superior efforts only if it is consumed by some superior ideal—this ideal is Christian spirituality and the values of enlightened patriotism. Our political aim is unquestionably to secure political influence in the country and eventually to become the ruling political party. I think our party is the only one in the country that proclaims the human individual as its highest value, and for Christians, for us, the individual is not an object of blind material evolution, it is the image and likeness of God. All our work is aimed at upholding the highest dignity of the human individual on earth. I think the Christian Democratic spectrum in politics is Russia's political future.

This is followed by a studio interview with two Soviet lawyers who have been given business training in the United States. It is noted that demand for their services is rapidly growing.

Next follows a report on a "Glasnost Day" festival in Gorkiy Park on 6 May. This is followed by music videos and advertisements.

The last news item is a report on a demonstration in Tallinn on 15 May by the Intermovement and Republican Strike Committee demanding a meeting with the republic's leaders. The report recalls Estonian leader Ryuytel appealed by radio for a counter-demonstration. The strike committee leaders gave in and the situation stabilized on 16 May. There follows interviews with strike commitee members who denounce Estonian leadership policies. Estonian Supreme Soviet Speaker Lauristen and Prime Minister Savisaar defend the government's record.

The 'Vzyglad' program concludes with a dance video, a report on a new rally vehicle, and replies to viewers questions.

United States & Canada

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to U.S.

Bush Welcomes Gorbachev

LD3105190390 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Washington May 31 TASS—At an official ceremony of welcoming Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, on a state visit to the United States, President George Bush and Gorbachev exchanged speeches.

Greeting the Soviet leader, Bush said that the United States wants "to move beyond containment in its relations with the Soviet Union toward a new era, an era of enduring cooperation."

"When we last met in Malta we agreed to accelerate our efforts on a full range of issues.

"Today, differences remain of course. But in the short six months since the Malta summit, we've made encouraging progress. And I want this summit to take us further still."

Speaking of changes that are taking place in Europe, the American President observed that both countries "can work together at this historic moment to further the process of building a new Europe, one in which every nation's security is strengthened and no nation is threatened."

Bush called for stronger cooperation in resolving regional conflicts and securing peace and stability.

Noting that the USSR and the United States demonstrated in Nicaragua that they can work together to promote peaceful changes, and that the two countries' efforts to settle Angola's tragic conflict are now paying off, Bush said:

"So let us expand this new spirit of cooperation, not merely to resolve disputes between us, but to build a solid foundation for peace, prosperity and stability around the world."

The President stressed that Americans welcome the Soviet Union's new policy and want to see perestroyka succeed.

In his reply speech, Gorbachev pointed out that Soviet-U.S. relations are acquiring greater stability, clarity and predictability.

He said that the signing of the treaty on the elimination of intermediate range missiles in December 1987 marked "a watershed, not only in our relations but in modern history. It was the first step taken together by two powerful countries on the road leading to a safe and sensible world."

Addressing Bush, the Soviet president remarked that "this generation of people on earth may witness the advent of an irreversible period of peace in the history of civilisation".

Speaking of the goals of his visit, Gorbachev said:

"My colleagues and I have come to do serious work in order to make a decisive step towards an agreement reducing the most dangerous arms, which are increasingly losing their political significance, and to provide further impetus to interaction between our two countries and, of course, cooperation in solving international problems, in trade, scientific, technological and humanitarian fields, in cultural exchanges, in expanding information about each other and in people-to-people contacts."

After the exchange of greetings the two leaders began the first round of negotiations.

Gorbachev Reply Speech

LD3105160890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1426 GMT 31 May 90

[Speech by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at arrival ceremonies at the White House in Washington—live]

[Text] Esteemed Mr. President, esteemed Mrs. Barbara Bush, ladies and gentlemen, comrades!

I thank you for this welcome and, in my turn, greet all citizens of the Unitd States of America on behalf of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

My present visit to the United States confirms that Soviet-U.S. relations are acquiring stability and growing more and more clear and predictable. I am convinced that both Soviet people and Americans approve of such changes, and I believe that they are also assessed according to their merit throughout the world.

But from this stems the President's and my enormous responsibility to ensure that the capital of trust and cooperation established in recent years is safeguarded and constantly increased.

I remember well my first arrival in the United States of America, not only because it was my first acquaintance with this country. In those December days in 1987, President Reagan and I signed the treaty on the elimination of medium-range missiles. It was truly a turning point, not only in our relations with you, but also in the whole of recent history. It was the first joint step by two powerful states along the road leading to a safe and sensible world. [applause]

Since then, our two great peoples have travelled a long way toward each other. Thousands of Americans and Soviet citizens and tens of state departments, private firms, and public organizations are now involved in political and business contacts, humanitarian exchanges, and scientific and technical cooperation.

In the same period, much has changed beyond recognition in the world around us.

Mr. President, the present generation of people on earth may witness the advent of an irreversibly peaceful period in the history of civilization. Walls which divided peoples for many years are collapsing; the trenches of the cold war are disappearing; and the fog of prejudice, distrust, and enmity is lifting.

I have arrived in the United States still under the impression of the festivities with which our people marked the 45th anniversary of the victory over fascism and the impression of gatherings with veterans. I have recently had many encounters and conversations with my fellow citizens. All of them understand the significance of Soviet-U.S. relations and link their improvement with the hope that the tragedies of the 20th century—the terrible wars—will remain forever a thing of history. Americans probably want the same.

I see, Mr. President, the meaning of our mission, of which our meeting is a part, to lie in justifying these hopes of our peoples.

My colleagues and I have come here with the intention of doing serious work in order to take a decisive step in drawing up an agreement on reducing dangerous weapons that are increasingly losing their political significance, and to give additional dynamism to the interaction between our countries, as well as additional dynamism to cooperation on international issues, in trade, in the scientific-technical and humanitarian spheres, in cultural exchanges, and in broadening information about each other and contacts between people. We are in favor of progress in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

I am looking forward to meetings with Americans and, as far as possible, a closer acquaintanceship with your great country.

On behalf of myself, Raisa Maksimovna, and everyone who has arrived with me in your capital, may I once again thank President George Bush and his wife and everyone present for the welcome we have been given. [applause]

Baker Previews Arms Accords

LD3105164390 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] New York May 31 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker said today that "some very, very important arms control agreements" could be worked out at the superpower summit.

In an interview with the ABC's "Good Morning, America" programme, Baker said: "The Soviets have now agreed with the United States on a chemical weapons destruction agreement.

"So these two superpowers can lead the way toward, perhaps, a global ban on chemical weapons, and that is very, very important."

President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev "have a good chance of agreeing on the major substantive issues in this strategic arms treaty", Baker remarked, commenting on the forthcoming talks.

In addition, he said, "there should be agreement on nuclear testing treaties that have been hanging out there for 15 years".

Baker said that the two leaders will also give much attention to the future of a unified Germany and the situation around Lithuania.

Gorbachev, Bush Meet Journalists

LD3105225690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Central television carried a live relay from Washington on the official welcoming ceremony for the USSR president outside the White House. The Soviet-U.S. talks also began in the White House today.

[Unidentified correspondent] Before the start of the talks, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Bush came out to the journalists gathered outside the White House. These photographs will go round all the world's newspapers tomorrow. [video shows Gorbachev and Bush taking photos in White House garden, then switches to Gorbachev, Bush, and interpreters inside White House, surrounded by cameramen]

[Bush in English followed by Russian translation] May I say welcome to the journalists from the Soviet Union. We are delighted that you all are here.

[Correspondent] Some [journalists] try to use the opportunity for a mini-interview.

[Gorbachev] The President has told me that there are no questions now while photographs are being taken. I share this. The first agreement has already been concluded.

[Correspondent] The first one-on-one conversation between the two leaders took place in the U.S. President's study, which does not happen here often. This apparently seconday detail attracted the particular attention of the Washington reporters.

Gorbachev Addresses Embassy Luncheon

LD3105220590 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 31 May 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] After talks with President Bush the Soviet head of state gave a luncheon at the [Soviet] Embassy for representatives of the American public. Among the guests were politicians Jesse Jackson and Henry Kissinger, film actors Jane Fonda and Gregory Peck, and historian Stephen Cohen.

The Soviet president addressed the audience to speak about reforms in the country and the problems encountered. He emphasized the great potential of perestroyka and the broad opportunities it was opening up for the world. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0240 GMT in an item on Gorbachev's 31 May activities, adds the following about his speech to the embassy luncheon: "Addressing the invited guests, Comrade Gorbachev spoke frankly about the progress of perestroyka, about the difficulties it is encountering, and about the mistakes and miscalculations which have been made, as well as the positive things which have been achieved."]

'Substantive' Talks on Germany

LD3105235290 Moscow TASS in English 2326 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Washington June 1 TASS—"Today's meeting of the Soviet and American delegations, involving the increased number of participants, was devoted to the exchange of views on developments in Europe and also on what is related to the settlement of the external aspects of the two German states' unification," President Mikhail Gorbachev told journalists upon the completion of the second round of talks with George Bush.

"I think that we had a substantive talk. We know better now each other's positions. We also understand better each other's concerns."

Gorbachev said both sides put forward some ideas regarding the German question, which deserve a more in-depth consideration by the two countries' foreign ministers and experts. Such instructions were given, he said.

Talks on Germany Continue

LD0106051190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] We have just received a report by TASS special correspondents from Washington. In the second half of the day, 31 May talks continued in the White House between the USSR and U.S. presidents, this time with the delegations' participation. The subject was a mutual assessment of the role of the two states in world politics at the present stage and the significance of better USSR-U.S. relations in light of the profound positive changes in the world.

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was leaving the White House, journalists put a number of questions to him. The first was this: Have you decided the German question?

I think, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, that the German question is not going to be decided here. I will explain: The meeting was devoted to an exchange of opinons on the situation in and the development of Europe, and in connection with this, on external aspects of German unification. I think the President and I had a thorough talk about this. Members of the delgations also took part. We are now presenting each other's positions and, I hope, anxieties in a better way.

Certain ideas were voiced by both the U.S. side and ourselves. In my view, the U.S. President agreed with this. The exchange of opinions which took place required a more in-depth examination of the question by the foreign ministers, with the participation of experts. Such instructions have been given. You are, of course, interested in more than what I have said, but we still do not know about everything.

Another question: Economic questions have been discussed. Will you be asking for any specific economic aid?

This is what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in reply: At my first meeting with the President today, one-to-one, we spoke more about the philosophy of our times, and in connection with this, about what our policy and the role and place of our two countries should be and how they should interact. Everything is changing rapidly in the world, and I think that if Malta had not taken place and there had not been the understanding and the definite accord which arose at the time, then we would have found ourselves unprepared in those winter months when such stormy events in Europe unfolded. But on Malta, at that time, we discussed the situation which was developing, predicted what kind of nature it might assume, what kinds of restraint it would require from everyone, and that it would be necessary to conduct a dialogue and—the main thing—to act in such a way as not to incite destabilization and as to allow the processes and peoples themselves the opportunity to sort themselves out and find their own solutions. That is the significance of our first meeting with President Bush. It went on longer than planned.

Yes, incidentally, in the context of the great changes in the USSR, Europe, and the world, economic processes too were examined. The President was particularly interested in our reform. I explained to him in principle the problems, which it has put before us. In this connection, the subject arose regarding the fact that at this time we should understand each other better, work together, and simplify the devlopment of events.

During the course of the current meeting, economic questions have so far been examined by the ministers. Tomorrow they will be the subject of discussion between the presidents.

Gorbachev Speaks at Banquet

LD0106011990 Moscow TASS in English 0100 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Washington June 1 TASS—"The Soviet Union does not regard the United States as its foe," President Mikhail Gorbachev said today. He spoke at a dinner given in his honour by U.S. President George Bush.

"We have firmly embarked on the course of moving from mutual understanding to interaction through cooperation," Gorbachev stressed. He voiced confidence that, as a result of the present summit, the USSR and the United States would reach a new level of interaction.

Even today, relations between the two countries have changed enormously as compared to what they were before the Geneva meeting of 1985, Gorbachev said. This is the fruit of joint work.

The improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations diminished the threat of war, Gorbachev went on. This is the all-important achievement of those years. About 20 bilateral agreements were concluded in a variety of areas. People-to-people exchanges from schoolchildren to scientists and economists were immeasurably expanded, which is especially valuable.

"I think that our joint work with President Bush these days can be assessed as one more step towards a more humane and just world," Gorbachev said.

Speaking about recent changes in the world, Gorbachev noted that the world had "significantly advanced towards a new and truly peaceful period in its millenium-old history. Global unification is a chance for civilisation to survive in conditions of the nuclear, ecological and other threats.

"But mankind cannot be only a community of survival. It should be a community of progress. Progress for all—East, West, North and South, for the industrialised and for as yet dispossessed.

Meanwhile, the very idea of progress, too, needs recomprehension, Gorbachev went on. [no end quotes as received] Mankind's ascent to the implementation of the concept of its history should proceed without unrepairable damage to the environment, without exploitation of man and whole peoples, withour irreversible moral and spiritual losses.

"We representatives of a country, in which more than a hundred peoples live together, possibly, know this better than anyone else," Gorbachev said. "Our own home needs overhaul and fundamental restructuring along the lines of reason and justice. We give ourselves an account of the scope of this undertaking, which is unequalled to anything mankind has ever known."

Judging by how the rest of the world responded to perestroyka, one may conclude that it is the necessary and wishful element of mankind's political and philosophical potential. "Therefore, in rethinking them and reshaping ourselves, we consider that we are making a contribution to the cause of global development and human unification," Gorbachev said.

"The building [of] a sound democratic system in our country has not been completed as yet," Gorbachev noted. "But I am convinced that the reserve of public energy already committed to implementing this great cause is enough to bring it to completion.

"I can firmly say that we will act proceeding from our values. We will act with determination but cautiously. Our platform aims to enable our society to reach a new quality. This will allow us to be both predictable participants in the international process and partners of all those who aspire for a reliable, just and free world. In building it, we hope for long-term cooperation with the United States of America."

The all-important thing in relations between the USSR and the United States and in world politics in general is yet to come, Gorbachev said. It is important not to lose sight of the goal, not to succumb to the temptations to gain unilateral advantages. We should advance towards it by overcoming the present and future difficulties and roadblocks, by working in cooperation and interaction.

Bush Notes 'Historic' Changes

LD0106011490 Moscow TASS in English 0028 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Washington June 1 TASS—The current Soviet-U.S. summit is taking place "at a time of great and historic change—in the Soviet Union, in Europe and around the world," said U.S. President George Bush.

He delivered remarks at a dinner in honour of visiting Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

"Such profound change is unsettling but also exhilarating," Bush said. "We do not shrink from the challenges before us but welcome them, determined to build the foundations of enduring peace and security."

Bush said that a series of agreements were to be signed within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. summit. These agreements "signify the progress our two nations have made in forging a new relationship. Agreements on everything from nuclear testing and chemical weapons—to expanded contacts between the people of America and the Soviet Union."

"These agreements are a continuation of all that began in Malta just six months ago—a foundation we can build on. Proof that differences can be resolved—even while others remain," Bush said.

Bush assured Gorbachev that "whatever deep differences divided us in the past, the United States and the American people approach every issue with a sincere belief that our two nations can find common ground."

Summit 'Developing Well'

LD3105214790 Prague CTK in English 2025 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Washington May 31 (CTK correspondent)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze told CTK here tody that the summit between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush is developing well.

In the first evaluation granted by any of direct participants in the talks to the press ever, Eduard Shevardnadze said that substantial results can be expected.

Asked whether Germany was discussed, the Soviet foreign minister said that only at a general level.

The answers of Eduard Shevardnadze have been so far the only substantial information granted to journalists about the course of the first round of the talks between the two statesmen. A planned press briefing had been several time postponed and the whole program of the summit is by about one hour delayed.

Soviet, U.S. Spokesmen Comment on 31 May Talks

LD0106081690 Moscow TASS in English 0721 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovsky]

[Text] Washington June 1 TASS—U.S. and Soviet presidential spokesmen Marlin Fitzwater and Arkadiy Maslennikov held their first joint briefings on Thursday.

The briefings were held at the International Press Centre of the U.S.-Soviet summit, where about 6,000 American and foreign reporters, including 180 reporters from the Soviet Union, are accredited.

Fitzwater told the briefing that Presidents George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev at their first meeting earlier in the day discussed problems connected with changes in the nature of East-West relations.

He said the meeting was friendly and that the presidents spoke about the future of their countries with optimism.

Fitzwater said the two leaders on Friday would sign a number of agreements that "hold promise for world peace."

At a separate White House meeting, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze considered numerous agreements and joint statements that are to be signed.

Fitzwater was unable to say whether a trade agreement would be signed at the summit. He noted that the presidents had not discussed this issue specially.

Gorbachev spokesman Arkadiy Maslennikov said that during the first meeting, which he said was of a "broad conceptual nature," Baker and Gorbachev discussed the future of the two countries and their "places in the international context and the context of the developments in Europe."

"The talks were businesslike, frank and very constructive," Maslennikov said. "Both presidents agreed that the first meeting set a very good beginning to further, more detailed discussions."

Asked about the Soviet reaction to Bush's remarks concerning differences between the United States and the Soviet Union over the Lithuanian issue, the spokesman said: "Lithuania is an internal problem of the Soviet Union, because it is part of the USSR and this problem should be solved on the basis of our constitution and laws adopted by our parliament."

At an evening briefing, Fitzwater and Maslennikov said that during the second Bush-Gorbachev meeting Bush said that, although there were differences between the two countries, he believed that U.S.-Soviet relations would increasingly improve.

The second meeting focussed largely on the reunification of Germany. The sides agreed that Shevardnadze and Baker and their experts would continue work on the issues discussed.

The profound discussion helped the sides achieve a better understanding of one another's positions. Many ideas needed further work on them and will be discussed at ministerial level.

The spokesman said the second meeting was very constructive and useful.

Asked why the two presidents did not believe that the German issue could be resolved at this summit, as they said in Thursday interviews, Fitzwater said the final decision should be made by Germany.

Maslennikov added that Gorbachev and Bush had a "very intensive and very friendly discussion, but failed to come to agreement. However, the very fact that they asked their ministers and experts to jointly work on this problem points to progress.

"We have the impressions that the presidents have begun to move toward one another, rather than away from one another. A long and difficult road to accord lies ahead, but it is very important that this is a road to accord, rather than disagreements."

PRAVDA Focuses on Arms Issues at Summit

PM3005192190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondents V. Gan, T. Kolesnichenko, V. Linnik, and V. Sukhoy: "'...No Longer Enemies'"]

[Text] Washington—"We vote for peace." That, figuratively speaking, is the atmosphere now prevailing in Washington.

People in the U.S. capital, as indeed throughout the country, understand perfectly well that the meeting beginning here between the Soviet and U.S. presidents is of great importance for the destiny of the world. A journalistic cliche, you may say. But no, a situation has now arisen in the world whereby the threat of nuclear catastrophe can be removed from mankind once and for all. It is no wonder that this meeting is described as the first between Presidents Gorbachev and Bush since the end of the "cold war." But, on the other hand, the new problems of the present have proven no less complex than before and await immediate solution.

This is understood on the banks of the Potomac. In discussions on the streets and in conversations with us, Washingtonians talk about the uniqueness of a situation where we, our peoples, really can act in such a way that everyone on earth has a more tranquil life. This unbreakable link between the state of affairs on the planet and the state of Soviet-U.S. relations has been stressed recently by both presidents. The headlong pace of changes in the world insistently dictates the need to strengthen and develop dialogue and trust and to realize the policy of new thinking in bilateral relations. In other words, the question is as follows: How, having wrested ourselves from the icy grip of confrontation, are we to live in the future? How is the world to be arranged once its survival is guaranteed? Particularly as far from everything is so serene in USSR-U.S. collaboration. The search for an optimum balance of interests between the two great powers is the task which has to be solved.

In that sense one must not approach the upcoming summit meeting solely from the quantitative standpoint of how many agreements will be signed. The qualitative aspect is, we think, more important, because an open, direct, face-to-face exchange of opinions, views, and ideas is invaluable in disposing of prejudiced judgments and stereotypes. As one senator said half-jokingly during a talk with your PRAVDA correspondents, "Even if Gorbachev and Bush just swap photographs of their grandchildren, that would be very important in itself."

From among the multitude of statements and assessments—and they currently abound on television and radio and in the newspapers—we would pinpoint one which, as we see it, really reflects the present state of Soviet-American relations. "We have not yet become friends, but we are no longer enemies" a State Department representative said. Yes, relations between us are complex and they are full of common interests and contradictions, cooperation and rivalry, agreements and disputes. Indeed, this is graphically confirmed by the actual agenda of the talks. So the meeting of the presidents promises to be both dynamic and interesting.

But whatever problems arise in the course of the meeting, the main problem on which progress will ultimately determine the success of the upcoming talks remains unchanged. That is, the task of reaching an agreement on strategic offensive arms undoubtedly takes pride of place here.

The newspapers here have just reported that the Soviet Union has begun to dismantle the Krasnoyarsk radar station, which has long caused complications at the strategic offensive arms talks. Another important compromise in clearing the path to this agreement has been reached.

Some people may say: What, another compromise? But that can be answered with another question: And what is an agreement if not a bundle of mutual concessions and compromises? How else can one reach agreement on what in this instance constitutes the crux of the problem of preserving life on earth?

If another specific illustration is required, one may look, for example, at air-launched cruise missiles. The Soviet Union long proposed including in the accord all missiles of this class whose range exceeds 600 km. The Americans did not agree. But a compromise has been reached now. The United States has accepted the Soviet proposal given that an exception will be made for cruise missiles carrying conventional warheads.

Mutual concessions also helped to reach consensus regarding sea-launched cruise missiles. The U.S. side has okayed the overall ceiling of 880 missiles proposed by the Soviet Union, while we have agreed that this limit be mentioned in a special political statement, but not in the text of the actual treaty on strategic offensive arms. An accord has also been reached that the two countries' warships will not be monitored by inspectors.

"Pop, what do you intend to do now?"—that was the question which one member of the Senate Armed Services Committee admitted his teenage son had asked the other day. The question was to the point, so to speak, since his father had for many years been involved in the process of talks on reducing and eliminating chemical weapons. And the USSR and the United States are now very close to concluding an agreement on reducing chemical arsenals.

After the signing of the treaty in this sphere, each side will retain the right to have a small quantity of chemical armaments but the production of new ones will be completely banned. This means that the United States will wind up its program to create binary weapons.

Again the question arises as to whether this is a lot or a little. It depends on how you look at it. Among friends "harboring" so many weapons is unnecessary, while among "enemies," judging by former times, there are not enough. But we think the most important thing is the fact that the process of disarmament is making headway.

No, we have not yet become friends, of course, and perhaps that is simply impossible. But we have now learned to talk and communicate with one another as human beings. In taking the "temperature" of Washington life before the presidents' meeting, we are, of course, chagrined to find that the mass media here often fail to find a kind word to say about us and blow up our problems in every possible way. It is permissible to ask: Is this really the main thing? The main thing is the perfectly clearly demonstrated desire of both sides to consolidate the ongoing progress in our relations.

Differences do, of course, exist. No one intends to diminish or suppress them. There is, for example, the difficult position in the Soviet Baltic and the attempts of many figures in Washington to dictate to us the pace and direction of the political processes under way there. There are the attempts to relaunch the "tactic of linkage"—do as we tell you, they say, and you will receive a trade agreement and most-favored-nation status.

Or take the problem of German unification. Here, in the United States, by the way, far from everyone supports the stance of the administration, which would like to incorporate Germany within NATO. Letters—perhaps from the relatives of those who met on the banks of the Elbe?—expressing alarm at the development of the situation in Germany are now coming into the PRAVDA bureau.

...Thus the final preparations, the final "premeeting maneuvers," as they are called here, are under way. Thousands of of journalists are frozen in readiness, as it were. CBS has just broadcast the results of a public opinion poll jointly carried out with THE NEW YORK TIMES: Americans support the Soviet president's activity 5:1...

As is the custom, the upcoming discussion between Gorbachev and Bush has already been the subject of constant advance commentary. The newspapers and television screens are full of meetings, arguments, and exchanges of opinions among political scientists and experts.

The rehearsals of the honor guard which will welcome the eminent visitor from Russia, which until recently intimidated America, have ended on the White House lawn. Strapping crew-cut guys are relaxing on the fresh grass, having loosened the stiff collars of their dress uniform jackets.

Washington is expectant and hopeful. And all of us, who speak different languages but are so alike, join with it in this.

Timing of Summit Trip, Effect of Yeltsin Viewed

LD3105122690 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Boris Yeltsin's election as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation is being viewed by many in the context of the Gorbachev-Bush summit. Observers in the United States suggest that the Soviet president comes to Washington at a time when his standing at home had weakened. Some even fear that agreements to be signed with the Soviet Union will never be implemented if there is a change of leadership in Moscow. Mikhail Mayorov has this commentary, and this is what he writes:

Relations between Gorbachev and Yeltsin are not simple, yet you cannot call them an uncompromising confrontation of the authority and opposition, be it in political or ideological terms. Both want their country to undergo sweeping reforms. But should these reforms be boosted given the present situation and public mood? Here Gorbachev and Yeltsin seem to disagree. Both leaders, however, are in the reformist camp and are likely to pursue the same goals. In doing so they may continue their dispute. In fact you can hardly find two persons in this country nowadays that agree on everything. But life itself will prompt Gorbachev and Yeltsin to seek compromise. If we forget what the layman says about their personal relations, we will see that Yeltsin's supporters voted for more perestroyka, a process that Gorbachev launched five years ago.

As for the Soviet-American summit, those American political analysts who allege that Gorbachev's position has weakened are encouraging George Bush to capitalize on the situation at the summit talks. Something is wrong on the American side, not Soviet. Some quarters are yielding to the temptation of speaking with the Soviet Union from the position of strength. Can't they see that the cold war is over and the Soviets and Americans must learn to live in the new conditions.

Mikhail Mayorov concludes by suggesting that we should let the presidents conduct their dialogue. True, they have very complex problems on their hands, but we should trust them just as they should trust and respect each other. Facing each other are two strong personalities as well as eminent statesmen who were the first to have nuclear missiles scrapped.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Previews Summit

PM3105101390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 May 90 First Edition p 3

[Telephone dispatch by special correspondent Captain FirstClass V. Kuzar: "Awaiting Decisions"]

[Text] Washington, 30 May—The U.S. capital welcomes the Soviet leader today. It cannot be said that this event has somehow changed the face of the city. Washingtonians' everyday life is still the same. The only new thinga to appear in the vivid palette of the city attesting to the forthcoming event are the Soviet flags. They are hanging outside the press center building and the hotels where representatives of the Soviet public and the journalists who will cover the summit are staying. I think there is a logic to the absence of the colorful external attributes which usually accompany events of this scale. After all, for all the importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit, it should be primarily a businesslike summit.

Concrete decisions are expected from the Soviet and U.S. presidents. This, in particular, was said at the press conferences held by both sides 29 May. Here it should be stressed that the latest summit has drawn a huge number of representatives of the mass media to Washington. More than 5,000 journalists from all over the world have already been accredited at the international press center.

Both the U.S. and Soviet press conferences discussed virtually the same thing: what the peoples can expect from the Soviet-U.S. summit talks. And they spotlighted the fact that it is probably quite natural that there should be different aspects to the essence of the questions to be raised. Take the problem of strategic offensive arms reduction. Whereas the U.S. press conference talked more about the technical aspects of the problem and the kinds of arms and types of warheads that would be cut, the organizers of the Soviet press conference focused attention more on the political aspect of the question

It should be noted that a question which has already been discussed in both the Soviet and U.S. press—the concessions which the Soviet Union has allegedly agreed to make to the United States in an effort to ensure the signing of an agreement on strategic offensive arms—has cropped up again. Answering this, A. Bovin, the well known Soviet international affairs journalist, noted that, following the publication of his article on the subject in IZVESTIYA, he has received many letters from his readers expressing alarm on this score. While sharing this alarm on the whole, he nonetheless allows of the possibility of unilateral concessions, provided, of course, that strategic conditions permit. I do not think that everyone will agree with that view. The Soviet Union and the United States currently have parity in the military-strategic sphere. And therefore any cuts should be bilateral—and the kind of cuts which will not destroy that parity. Otherwise one side would gain an advantage, which could have serious consequences were the political situation to change.

One other "sore point" is the question of the future of Germany. During the U.S. press conference a great deal was said about the need to include a united Germany in NATO. It was stressed that, because of its negative attitude to this way of raising the issue, the Soviet Union could delay the unification process. The participants in the Soviet press conference noted that German unification should proceed side by side with the formation of a collective security system in Europe, and that a future Germany should have commitments guaranteeing both its security and the security of its neighbors. At bottom, both the U.S. and the Soviet positions have points of contact, which makes it possible to work out a mutually acceptable approach to the process of German unification. The main thing here is to show willingness, to take account of the other side's interests, and not to forget that the question of German unification is bound up with the future of Europe. The existence of opposing armies on the continent today is fraught with great danger.

During the discussions the fact that the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces have not yet acquired the necessary dynamics did not pass unnoticed. These talks need additional impetus. The Soviet side believes that the foundations of a future agreement have already been prepared, on the whole. Accords have been reached on categories of conventional armed forces to be cut. There are six types of such forces—personnel, aircraft, helicopters, tanks, armored vehicles, and artillery. Agreement has already been reached on a number of categories. However, the question of aircraft and the limitation of Soviet and U.S. troops in Europe outside the boundaries of their national territories is still unresolved. The opinion was expressed that the forthcoming meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents could provide the necessary impetus to enable final agreements to be reached.

Naturally, concrete decisions are expected not only on security issues. The problems of bilateral Soviet-U.S. ties and of trade and economic cooperation are very important. Here too a great deal depends on the U.S. side. As AP officials stressed in conversation with me, it is a matter of honor for the U.S. leadership to sign a Soviet-U.S. trade treaty without any political strings attached. Well, in the current complex economic conditions our country would welcome Washington's readiness to expand trade cooperation as much as possible. This would not only promote perestroyka processes in the USSR, but would also open up new horizons in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Further Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Canada

Speech at Ottawa Luncheon

LD3105144790 Mosow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 31 May 90

[Speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president, at an official luncheon hosted by Brian Mulroney, Canadian prime minister, at the Canadian National Gallery in Ottawa on 30 May—recorded, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Esteemed Prime Minister; Esteemed Mrs. Mulroney; ladies and gentlemen; comrades:

I would first of all like to express my sincere gratitude for the invitation to visit your country and for your cordiality and hospitality. It is deeply symbolic that, once again, we are discovering America by stepping onto Canadian soil. Exactly seven years ago, in May 1983, I was in your country as part of a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation. We have retained the most vivid memories of that first meeting with Canada and the Canadians. I am glad that I have the opportunity once again to greet my old acquaintances. I can see them here in this room. I hope for fresh acquaintance.

The USSR and Canada are natural partners in the international community. They know each other quite well, especially since there are many emigrants from Russia in Canada. But, the times are such that this knowledge must be constantly supplemented, and sometimes amended too. However, it is good that there are also unchanging things, including the feeling of sympathy which, by ridding us of the ideological prejudices and fears of the cold war, has helped us to reach new Soviet-Canadian relations. They are gathering energy in the spirit of the impending era. Over the past seven years a Soviet-Canadian political dialogue has also taken shape as the leading instrument of our cooperation.

During a period of stormy transformations and a radical breaking of established ideas and stereotypes, contacts and mutual understanding between states acquire particular value, especially between those states that have specific obligations before the world community. It is precisely in this context that we value the good-neighborliness between the USSR and Canada. They have been affected by geography and history, which create a good, natural terrain in which to find a balance of the national interests of the two countries. Today, at a turning point of world history and politics, the good sentiments and creative aspirations of our people could serve as a northern butress for a bridge of trust and security between East and West and for the new, democratic, international relations with which humanity will enter into the 21st century.

I can note that the challenge presented by time has not taken the Soviet Union and Canada unawares. In their relations with each other and with the rest of the world they have always shown farsightedness, they have not exacerbated points where tension has arisen, and they have attempted to use any opportunity to improve the situation. We were able to cooperate as early as the time of the origins of the Helsinki process, and now we will together draw a final line under that dreadful war in which we fought arm-in-arm as allies against the forces of tyranny and obscurantism.

We are against always looking to the past; but without taking account of its lessons, it is impossible to bring closer a free and secure future, a future in which there is no place for anti-humanitarianism and revenge and which will be built voluntarily and on humane principles. We regard Soviet-Canadian cooperation as an inseparable and essential supporting structure of the future common European home. We are also brought closer by an awareness of our responsibility for the fate of the Third World. Its very acute problems are becoming one of humanity's primary concerns as the threat of nuclear war disappears. The Arctic—the roof and source of the plant's life—has been and remains an area of specific cooperation between our two countries who are neighbors across the Arctic Ocean. And last—although not, of course, least—there are our efforts to curb the arms race and our participation in the disarmament process. Those are the main parameters of the ascent of Soviet-Canadian dialogue. We have also appreciated the interest, the quite wide-ranging understanding, and even solidarity, with Soviet perestroyka that we have encountered in Canadian society and in the Canadian people.

The prime minister has described our recent talks in Moscow as a new beginning in Soviet-Canadian relations. For our part, I would like to stress once again that I value highly the personal contact that has been established between us. Since they express the will of millions of people, contemporary world politics should be built upon such contacts. After our new discussions—substantive and frank discussions—I dare to say our mutual understanding has now deepened and become stronger.

On the whole, the events of the past months confirm the correctness of our evaluation of the official visit to the USSR by Prime Minister Mulroney as an event which helps change the whole international situation for the better. The political declaration that was signed in Moscow was an intellectual and political-diplomatic contribution to the general efforts of states in moving toward an irreversible peaceful period of history. This document itself is evidence of the will of the two countries to build their relations on a fundamentally new basis. The declaration and subsequent contacts on various levels allow us to say that Soviet-Canadian dialogue has become a planned political process by two active and prestigious members of the world community.

Soviet-Canadian comercial and economic links are a special topic. It is worth stressing that neither the USSR nor Canada attempted previously to politicize them; they did not cast doubt over the need to develop them on a basis of equality and mutual benefit. The scale and continuity of our cooperation in this sphere and the existence of a reliable legal treaty foundation allow us to count on a new dynamic in conditions of the radicalization of economic reform in the USSR and on an understanding of the particularities and difficulties of the transition stage to a new system for the Soviet economy.

The Canadian Government's unambiguous position in support of business circles that are oriented toward cooperation with the USSR and their initiatives which help in linking our economy to the world economic system is a cause of satisfaction. In doing this we state clearly: It is not a question of aid from the West, but of cooperation on a mutually beneficial basis in establishing a new economy in our country, which represents an enormous and very wealthy part of the world's potential, and giving it back to a world economic context of full value, as we consider this necessary and advantageous for all.

At the same time, economic interconnectedness and interdependence impart a stable and long-term nature to the political process, both bilateral and multilateral. In this connection, I would like to count on new and contemporary cooperation, the creation of joint enterprises undergoing further development. We link great hopes with the activities of the Canadian-Soviet business council which was founded in Moscow in November last year. Its support by both governments has already found expression in the signing at that time of an agreement on encouragement and mutual protection of capital investments.

I would like to state that, in the future too, Canadian business circles may count on the most attentive attitude toward their initiatives and activity in our country. We have a high evaluation of the goodwill and farsightedness of Canadian business in the personage of such major figures of the Canadian business and financial world as (Albert Reichmann). The realistic and bold approach that is characteristic of them creates major strong points for economic interdependence between our countries and also has symbolic and principled significance.

I told the prime minister in Moscow that autarchy was alien to us and that we were prepared to depend on other countries, but only, of course, to the extent that they were prepared to depend on us. I don't think Canada has any grounds to fear such interdependence. It is caused by life, the times, and our common human destiny in the new era.

My talks with Prime Minister Mulroney make it possible to say that the route of Soviet-canadian cooperation is clear and predictable. I am assuming that we will follow that route together at a good pace. There is a great deal of work ahead to implement agreements that have already been signed and accords that have been reached, and to seek fresh opportunities.

Let us hope that our bonds will strengthen, for they are not directed against anyone, they do not encroach upon anyone's sovereignty. On the contrary, they strengthen that holy of holies: national dignity. In doing this we are serving our peoples by participating at the same time in the creation of a new world community in the name of progress and peaceful civilization. In addressing you, I am addressing the remarkable Canadian people, our close neighbor and, I believe, friend.

In conclusion, allow me once again to greet and thank Prime Minister Mulroney and Mrs. Mulroney. To the health of all those present, to the success and prosperity of the Canadian people, to Soviet-Canadian friendship and cooperation.

Reception Speeches Cited

LD3105131290 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Ottawa May 31 TASS—Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney described Soviet-Canadian relations as mutually beneficial at a reception given on Wednesday for President Mikhail Gorbachev. The reception, held at the grand hall of the National Gallery, was attended by members of the government, businessmen, members of the public and diplomats.

The prime minister stressed that since Gorbachev's last visit in 1983, marked changes have occurred in East-West relations. A whole class of nuclear armaments is being phased out and destroyed, while programmes for modernising U.S. short-range nuclear weapons have been cancelled.

The Soviet Union and the U.S. are close to achieving agreement on considerable cuts in strategic nuclear weapons and chemical weapons stockpiles. Both sides have already pledges to cut their troops in Europe. Thanks to "new thinking" people in the Soviet Union, Canada, and in the world now live in safer conditions than in 1983, the prime minister stressed.

Speaking about the ongoing processes in Europe, Mulroney welcomed the establishment of a single democratic Europe and said it will help strengthen the security of all countries. At the same time, the Canadian premier spoke out in favour of NATO membership for a united Germany which, he said, would increase rather than diminish Soviet security. He also urged NATO to readjust to changing circumstances and have a higher political profile.

Mulroney praised perestroyka and democratisation in the Soviet Union and especially stressed the importance of laying the groundwork for more fruitful political and economic relations with Western countries.

The political declaration signed in Moscow last November set the tone and direction of Canadian-Soviet relations for many years ahead and set the stage for cooperation on a wide range of bilateral and multilateral issues, Mulroney stressed.

"The USSR and Canada are natural partners in the international community," said the Soviet president. Describing the development of Soviet-Canadian relations, Gorbachev noted that "they are gaining momentum in the spirit of the coming epoch." The past few years saw "the emergence of the Soviet-Canadian dialogue as the major characteristic of our interrelationship," he stressed.

"At this crucial stage of world and political history," he said, "the good feelings and constructive desires of our peoples can serve as the 'northern support' for the bridge of trust and security between East and West, for the new democratic international relations, with which mankind will enter into the 21st century. We regard Soviet-Canadian relations as an inalienable and important structure of the future common Europe home."

Gorbachev especially singled out Soviet-Canadian trade relations. "Neither the USSR nor Canada ever sought to politicise them nor doubted the need to develop them on a basis of equality and mutual benefit." The Soviet president expressed satisfaction with the Canadian Government's support of business circles that want to deal with the Soviet Union.

"The route of Soviet-Canadian relations is clear and predictable. I think that we will traverse this route at a good pace," Gorbachev said.

'New Melody' From West Urged

LD3105134690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 31 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, after completing his visit to Canada, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived in the United States. Our special correspondents report from Ottawa and Washington.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V. Fotinov] The central entrance to the building of Canada's Federal Parliament. In the lobby, the Soviet leader and those acompanying him are welcomed by speakers of the House of Commons and the Senate. They remember Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's address to Canadian parliamentarians during his first visit to Canada in 1983.

The welcoming ceremony is over, the Soviet president is invited to put his signature in the book of honorary visitors of the House of Commons and the Senate.

Before tete-a-tete talks start, photographs are taken in the study of the Canadian Prime Minister.

[Mulroney in English with superimposed Russian translation] Before this distinguished group, Mr. President, I would like to welcome you in connection with your visit to the Canadian Parliament.

[Fotinov] Naturally, the press was barred from the tete-a-tete talks. We journalists are a patient lot and waited for the talks to end to ask questions.

[Unidentified reporter] Could you say briefly what was the subject of your lengthy conversation?

[Gorbachev, in Russian, through interpreter] We have been discussing things of concern to all of us.

[Unidentified reporter] Did you touch upon the Baltics?

[Gorbachev] Yes, we talked about that yesterday.

[Unidentified reporter] And what did you say?

[Gorbachev] What I had already said and what is well known. We are in favor of finding a solution to this problem within the framework of the constitutional process. We spoke about a very interesting stage that has opened in our bilateral relations. I would say that Mr. Mulroney's last visit to us, to the Soviet Unions, and the very important documents, declarations, and a number of agreements signed there have brought our economic cooperation to a different level. Today we returned to the Moscow conversation and reviewed the situation. In principle, we are satisfied. Good opportunities are opening up.

And also we spoke very much about Europe, the Soviet Union, and the problems that we are to solve in relation to German reunification. I am referring to the external aspects of this process. This issue took a lot of our time. The key point of my arguments was that, for all the importance of this issue, it has a subordinate nature. I have in mind the external problems of German reunification. We have to find a solution that would strengthen rather than damage the enormous changes that have unfolded both in Europe and international relations.

[Unidentified reporter] Do you favor a neutral Germany?

[Gorbachev] I want a solution that would strengthen the positive processes that have unfolded within the framework of the new thinking. Let it be our common solution. But so far, however, I have not heard any alternative from the West. It reminds one of an old gramophone where the needle got stuck and the record plays the same note again and again. I would like to give it a push so that it skips the damaged portion and plays a new melody. Goodbye.

[Mulroney] We will wind up making better music.

Petrovskiy Receives Visiting U.S. Congressman

PM3105120990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 90 Moscow Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Reception"]

[Text] On 26 May USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy received D. Nagle, Democrat member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Iowa.

D. Nagle gave him a detailed briefing on the package of legislative proposals he had submitted to Congress designed to remove all existing obstacles to the complete normalization of East-West relations.

V.F. Petrovskiy also held a meeting with J. Mroz, director of the internation East-West Institute.

Parliamentary Delegation Arrives in Canada

LD3105081190 Moscow TASS in English 0544 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Toronto May 31 TASS—A Soviet parliamentary delegation arrived on an official visit here today at the invitation of the Canadian Parliament's leadership.

The delegation is headed by Rafik N. Nishanov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Council of Nationalities.

In addition to Toronto, the 10-day trip will take the delegation to Montreal, Quebec and Ottawa, Canada's capital, where it will acquaint itself with the work of the legislatures of Ontario and Quebec Provinces and meet businessmen and members of the public.

The Soviet legislators will discuss with their Canadian colleagues a wide range of problems related to the international situation, bilateral relations and the broadening of contacts between the parliaments of the two countries.

Northeast Asia

REUTER Cited on No Tae-u, Gorbachev Summit

SK0106063090 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Korean President No Tae-u will meet Mikhail Gorbachev in San Francisco, in the United States, on 3 June, and then hold talks with U.S. President George Bush in Washington and brief him on the results of his meeting.

The REUTER NEWS AGENCY has reported this from Seoul, quoting a statement by the Korean Government.

The statement has expressed the conviction that the highest-level Korean-Soviet meeting will contribute to creating an atmosphere in favor of the peaceful reunification of Korea and to peace and security on the Korean peninsula.

As for Soviet-Korean (?cooperation) and relations, particularly links in the trade and economic field, these ties have been expanded in recent years.

Envoy to Moscow Received by Shevardnadze

SK3005064990 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 28 May 90

[From the "News on Cooperation" program under the "Annals of Friendship" program]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received Son Song-pil, DPRK ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union. During the talks, the intention of the two countries to develop and enhance the overall traditional friendship between the Soviet Union and Korea were confirmed. They also indicated the need to make [word indistinct] future cooperation complete, and to enhance its effectiveness.

With regard to developing issues between the North and South—such as abolishing the presence of foreign military forces, strengthening peace, and putting an (?end) to the nation's national division—Eduard Shevardnadze expressed the solidarity of the Soviet Union on the principled position of the DPRK toward Korea's political [word indistinct].

Son Song-pil said that the DPRK wishes success for reforms that are being carried out in the Soviet Union. He also highly assessed the activities of the Soviet foreign policy in promoting peace and stability in Asia, the Pacific region, and the whole world.

Reelection of DPRK's Kim Il-song Reported

PM3105124590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 90 p 5

[TASS report: "Leader Remains Leader"]

[Text] The election of Kim Il-song to a new term as DPRK president, elections of personnel of the central organs of state administration, and ratification of the 1990 state budget law—these are the results of the first session of the country's Ninth Supreme People's Assembly which ended here today.

The current session, deputies emphasized in their speeches, has shown the "iron will and resolve" of the DPRK people "to revere the great leader highly and follow him devotedly," and "to achieve the republic's eternal prosperity and gain the Korean revolution's final victory under the leadership of the party and the leader." The session testifies to the "inviolability" of the DPRK's model of socialism and its "vitality."

The deputies found the DPRK's state budget performance results for last year satisfactory. Total revenue is scheduled to increase 6.1 percent in 1990, while expenditure is scheduled to increase 6.8 percent. The republic's government is making provision for the allocation of 12.1 percent of the state budget for defense needs.

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Congratulate DPRK Leaders

LD2505182590 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 25 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 25 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov sent greetings to Kim Il-song and Yon Hyong-muk on their election as president of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and premier of the Administrative Council amd wished them success in their responsible work.

The Soviet leaders' telegrams express certainty that relations of friendship and multilateral cooperation between the Soviet Union and DPRK, having deep historic roots, will continue to develop to the mutual benefit of the two peoples, in the interest of peace, progress and security in the Asia-Pacific region.

Ryzhkov Message to Counterpart

PM2905123190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Text of message from N. Ryzhkov "To Comrade Yon Hyong-muk, premier of the DPRK Administrative Council"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Yon Hyong-muk,

I congratulate you on your election as premier of the DPRK Administrative Council.

I hope that the friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the DPRK will continue to develop and strengthen in the interests of the Soviet and Korean peoples.

I wish you successful activity in this responsible post.

[Signed] N. Ryzhkov.

Frolov Holds Talks, News Conference in Japan

PM2905141390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[Special correspondents S. Kolesnikov and I. Latyshev report under the "Tokyo Calling" rubric: "Interest in Perestroyka"]

[Text] Tokyo, 24 May—Yesterday and today, I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, held a number of conversations with representatives of the Japanese capital's business, political, and journalist circles. He met for some two hours with Rokuro Ishikawa, president of the Japan Chamber of Commerce and Industry, who is an influential leader of the country's business community. Ishikawa showed great interest in the economic and social aspects of the Soviet perestroyka.

The interlocutors extensively discussed theoretical and practical questions relating to ways to overcome the difficulties which have arisen in the Soviet Union in the transition from the administrative-command system to a regulated market economy. A large part of Ishikawa's comments were devoted to listing the various factors contributing to Japan's economic successes, which were greeted abroad as an "economic miracle." Among the main factors leading up to this "miracle" the leader of Japan's business circles highlighted the postwar democratic transformations of the country's political and state system, the radical land reform which eliminated large country estates, the raising of the population's general educational standard, and the considerable economic, scientific, and technical assistance that Japan received from the United States in the decades immediately after the war for the purpose of turning it into an ally and bastion of influence in the Far East. Ishikawa also stressed the significant role played by the major Japanese companies' strenuous efforts to ensure the high quality of their output, to lower its costs, and to develop to the utmost the rationalizing initiatives of employees at all levels and stages of production.

The interlocutors agreed that one of the most important factors which has held back the production of consumer goods in the Soviet Union was the burden of military spending connected with the cold war and the military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union and with the arms race in which the Soviet Union found itself embroiled. At the end of the conversation, Ishikawa expressed the hope that the implementation of the accords now outlined between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States will make it possible to break the vicious circle of the arms race, which will be a boon for the peoples of the two countries and of the whole world.

The Japanese public's very keen interest in events in our country was shown in the desire of a large number of representatives of the Japanese press to interview the CPSU Central Committee secretary and hear his comments on the most topical questions of international relations and the Soviet Union's domestic life. Today the Soviet guest gave a two-hour exclusive interview to the newspaper ASAHI, which has long maintained friendly contacts with the PRAVDA editorial office. Next the Japanese journalists' club was the venue for a scheduled news conference given by I.T. Frolov, involving more than 100 representatives of the mass media. The audience listened very attentively to the Soviet visitor's speech, which contained an analysis of the complex and contradictory processes taking place in the Soviet Union during the revolutionary perestroyka. The speech also touched on a number of international problems connected with the imminent Soviet-U.S. summit and also the proposed visit of USSR President Gorbachev to Japan, scheduled for 1991. A sizable part of I.T. Frolov's speech was dedicated to the 28th CPSU Congress in July, which is expected to have a powerful, positive influence on the course of perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

Replying to questions, the CPSU Central Committee Secretary gave the audience an account of the essence of the discussion within the party in the run-up to the congress and stressed the broad democratic character, typical of the present stage of perestroyka, of Soviet Communists' discussion of contentious issues and the decisive role of the forthcoming congress in summing up the results of that discussion.

In his replies, I.T. Frolov paid great attention to prospects for the development of Soviet-Japanese relations. Stressing the great importance attached by the Soviet Union to the USSR president's visit to Japan next year, he expressed the hope that the Japanese side will also approach the preparation of the visit with due responsibility. In the Soviet Union, I.T. Frolov said, it is clearly understood that before M.S. Gorbachev's visit there is work to be done on a whole series of most complex problems, which should determine reciprocal relations between our country and Japan. Some questions will doubtless be resolved. On some progress will be made, on others dialogue will begin, and so on. There are many forms for the talks process and they will all be used both in the preparation for the visit and in the visit itself.

Today's meetings between the CPSU Central Committee secretary and representatives of the press highlighted

Japanese journalists' benevolent attitude toward perestroyka in the Soviet Union and their positive approach to the consolidation of Soviet-Japanese good neighborliness.

Mongolia's Gungaadorj Discusses Market Economy

LD3105223990 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Mongolian Prime Minister Sharavyn Gungaadorj has said in a radio and television interview that transition to a market is the most important way of stabilizing the economy and raising the standard of living. The monopoly of state property is going to be replaced by a plurality of types of property. The policy of encouraging average and small businesses has been announced. The aim is to produce goods that would be competitive on the world market.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Official Praises Cambodia Settlement Effort

LD3105170190 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—A high-ranking Soviet Foreign Ministry official has described the New York May 25-26 meeting of deputy foreign ministers from the U.N. Security Council permanent member-states as a "significant event in the negotiating process to settle the Cambodian problem".

Yuriy Myakotnykh, deputy head of the Asian Socialist Countries' Department at the USSR Foreign Ministry, told journalists here today that "certain changes" became visible in efforts to resolve the key issues.

These issues include the structures of power in the transitional period, the fate of the armed forces, human rights and the prevention of the restoration of the genocidal regime.

Myakotnykh observed that the changes became possible as a result of contacts between Cambodian parties and Thailand's "vigorous activity."

He praised Thailand and Japan for helping bring about an agreement to convene a meeting of Cambodian parties in Tokyo early in June to discuss these major issues.

Moscow International on Burmese Elections

Oleg Shchedrov Commentary

BK0106101590 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1430 GMT 31 May 90

[Commentary by Oleg Shchedrov]

[Text] Listeners: Official counting of last Sunday's national elections in Burma continues. It has been learned, taking the communications situation into consideration, that counting would take up to three weeks. Moscow Radio observer, Oleg Shchedrov, however, says that generally the elections results are becoming clearer. His comments are as follows:

The experiment in monopolizing power in every sphere has failed. In studying the mass uprising, the subsequent inability of the military authorities to turn back developments by suppressing the uprising through various means and the holding of a democratic general elections, we notice a drama script which is becoming familiar to us.

This time the drama takes place in Asia—in Burma. The initial elections returns are indeed remarkable with the opposition National League for Democracy [NLD] winning 388 out of the 485 seats. The National Unity Party [NUP], the party favored by the military government, appears to have won not more than 15 seats.

The military government has partially conceded defeat. They have promised to hand over power to a civilian government as soon as a new constitution is drafted. A military government spokesman has announced that the opposition could assume power as soon as it wishes and that the Defense Services will accept the new constitution.

In its preelection manifesto, the NLD had pledged to form an interim government based on a new constitution if it wins the election in order to hold further elections. There will, therefore, be an interim period. Events during this period will depend on the loyalty of the military government and on its willingness to recognize and accept the concrete conditions of the country. As of now, the NLD leaders, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and U Tin U, cannot be active politically with the former being under house arrest and the latter imprisoned. An opposition spokesman has said that the Defense Services should release them and they could do so by giving an excuse to save face. If it happens, well and good. However, up till now, the military government has not said anything about releasing Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, U Tin U, and their followers.

There is a maxim which says that not all things can be compared. Every region and country have their own unique ideologies and characteristics. However, the election results in Burma have shown that there are certain facts which could not be disregarded. The aspiration for democracy is one of them. Today, such aspirations are widespread in Europe. The Moscow Radio observer concluded by asking whether such aspiration had reached Asia.

Aleksandr Vladimirov Commentary

BK3105134990 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1430 GMT 30 May 90

[Commentary by Aleksandr Vladimirov]

[Text] There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the election held last Sunday [27 May] in Myanmar [Burma] was won by the party led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the National League for Democracy [NLD]. This being the case, the main concern in Myanmar today is the transfer of power by the military government to the civilian organizations.

Spokesmen for the State Law and Order Restoration Council [SLORC] have said many times in recent days that the state power will be transferred without any preconditions after the promulgation of a new state Constitution and the formation of a new government. However, that very statement in itself is a precondition, says U Kyi Maung, the de facto leader of the NLD Central Executive Committee following the detention of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi.

The NLD leadership believes that since the SLORC wields the power today, it essentially should take the first steps to hold talks with the opposition parties which won the election, convene a parliamentary session, and discuss the formation of a civilian government. U Kyi Maung said that as a gesture of goodwill, the military government should release Daw Aung San Suu Kyi from detention.

Moreover, U Kyi Maung said that his party already has in hand a draft state constitution to be studied discussed in parliament. The draft is mainly based on the constitution adopted by Myanmar when it gained independence. That draft constitution contains stipulations which will set up a parliament similar to the ones in the United Kingdom and India. It also permits self-rule to nationalities in the non-Burman areas.

Judging from the fact that emphasis is being given to the question of interrelations between nationalities even in the initial stages of laying down its policies, it is obvious that the NLD intends to work with conviction to resolve the problem of the decades-old armed conflict between the Yangon [Rangoon] government and the ethnic minorities who reside in the remote border areas of Myanmar.

The correspondent from TASS news agency in Yangon visited NLD headquarters on the very first day of vote counting. U Kyi Maung, who was very busy at the time because of the euphoric news coming in together with the results from the provinces, took some time off and said: You may not know how grateful we are to your great president, Gorbachev. Without his perestroyka restructuring, we may not have been able to engage in our struggle for democracy.

Dear listeners: In an interview with Radio Moscow two months ago, a Soviet historian, Vladimir Vasilyev, pointed out that the events in Myanmar in 1988 were actually a people's democratic revolution against the government of military bureaucrats.

Most Soviet academics studying Myanmar affairs are also of the same opinion. The world public is witnessing today the victory of the people's democratic revolution which, by all appearances, has the prospects of achieving its goals without violence and through a parliamentary process.

Nguyen Van Linh Writes on Ho Chi Minh

*90UF0179A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 May 90 Second Edition p 5*

[Article by Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party: "The Work of Ho Chi Minh Lives Forever"]

[Text] Hanoi—**On 19 May the Vietnamese people, along with all progressive humanity, will celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ho Chi Minh—the hero of the national liberation of Vietnam and an outstanding political figure. This remarkable date is also being celebrated in the international organization UNESCO.**

In honor of Ho Chi Minh's memory, these days the Vietnamese people are recalling the life, deeds, ideas, and lessons left to us by the greatest son of the Vietnamese nation. Now as never before we feel that his ideas and behests continue to be a compass for us in the construction of socialism. Continuing to live in the heart of every Vietnamese, Ho Chi Minh attentively and solicitously shows us the path to progress. By following his example we feel that we are purer and are imbued with great faith and energy.

After a half century of the heroic but unsuccessful struggle against foreign domination, the Vietnamese people entered the 20th century enslaved and having lost their statehood. Subsequent liberation movements, under the influence of feudal, petit bourgeois, and bourgeois ideology, were also defeated. At that time the Vietnamese people were faced with an historically immediate necessity: to find a new idea that could point the way to the conquest of freedom and independence. It was this idea that tormented the thoughts of the young patriot Nguyen Tat Thanh (this is what the young Ho Chi Minh was called—ed.). In 1911 Nguyen Tat Thanh, under the pseudonym Va, set out from the Saigon port of Nha Rong to go abroad to seek the path of salvation of his homeland. For 10 years, right up until 1920, having tried out a number of professions, he earned his living by heavy labor and visited many countries of Asia, Europe, Africa, and America. He lived and worked for a long time in England and France. Wherever Ho Chi Minh was, he cherished the thought of independence for his homeland.

For 10 years he traveled the enormous distance from traditional Vietnamese culture to modern world culture, from the national patriotic movement to the national liberation and revolutionary movement of modern times, and at the same time he accumulated the richest arsenal of practical knowledge and achieved a high level of culture. And after that, he was able to recognize the truth he had sought before leaving for abroad: For the oppressed and exploited, lofty words about equal rights, freedom, and brotherhood were a lie since the colonizers were barbarically cruel everywhere and those colonized lived in poverty. There was lawlessness and crime everywhere in the capitalist world.

Thinking about the fate of his compatriots, Nguyen Ai Quoc (party name of Ho Chi Minh—ed.) lamented for all the oppressed in the world and fought for their liberation. It followed logically that Nguyen Ai Quoc adopted Marxism-Leninism and became a communist. This occurred at the end of 1920 when he had read Lenin's "Theses on the National Question." As Ho Chi Minh was to say later, he wept from joy and, turning his thoughts to the oppressed people of Vietnam, he exclaimed: "Unfortunate, tormented compatriots, this is what you need! This is the path to our liberation!"

Illuminated by the great name of Lenin, Nguyen Ai Quoc arrived at the truth: "The only correct path to salvation of the homeland is a proletarian revolution." From that time until the end of his life, for Nguyen Ai Quoc-Ho Chi Minh, patriotism and internationalism comprised a unified whole in both thoughts and deeds.

President Ho Chi Minh provided a brilliant example of creative application of Marxism-Leninism. On the basis of the theoretical tenets of Lenin and the Comintern about the importance of the colonial question in the stage of imperialism, Ho Chi Minh drew conclusions that were of practical significance for the struggle of the colonized peoples for their liberation. These were conclusions to the effect that the national liberation struggle could be victorious even before the accomplishment of a proletarian revolution in metropolitan areas, that the colonized peoples could and should achieve their own liberation even without relying on the proletariat of the metropolitan areas, and conclusions about mutual assistance and about organic but mutually independent ties between the revolution in the East and the revolution in the West.

These included the great and brilliant strategic idea of the need and possibility for the unification of all people in the matter of national liberation. It was developed and implemented by Ho Chi Minh during the course of the revolution in Vietnam. He generalized it in the form of a well-known popular truth: "Great unification—great victory."

In light of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, President Ho Chi Minh outlined his victorious course: Having accomplished a national, popular-democratic revolution, it was to grow into a socialist revolution, bypassing the stage of capitalist development.

He created and forged the factors of victory in this course—the Communist Party of Vietnam—the glorious staff and vanguard of the working class and all the Vietnamese people; the unified national front whose pivot is the union of the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of the party; the heroic people's armed forces, born of the people and fighting for them; and solidarity and mutual support between the Vietnamese revolution and the world revolution on the principles of internationalism.

Ho Chi Minh and the Communist Party of Vietnam developed various methods of fighting the revolutionary battle, the correctness of which was confirmed during their application in practice. They are most clearly reflected in the theory and practice of the people's war.

From his own experience and from his experience in the Vietnam war, Ho Chi Minh came to the conclusion that Marxism-Leninism is an invincible weapon. He always provided an excellent example of creative application of these teachings, taking into account the concrete historical conditions of Vietnam. He demanded that we learn to anticipate, constantly keep up to date, and constantly enrich our spiritual baggage, gleaning new experience from revolutionary actions. He said: "We must learn Marxism-Leninism in order to analyze and apply solutions to concrete problems of the revolution in our country, taking its special conditions into account. While applying it we must enrich the theory with new conclusions that follow from our revolutionary practice."

President Ho Chi Minh was well aware that a decisive factor for victory in a revolution is the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party. As early as 1927 he pointed out that in order to achieve victory "above all it is necessary to have a revolutionary party," since "only a strong party will be able to provide for the triumph of the revolution."

In order to make the party a politically, ideologically, and organizationally strong vanguard after it came to power, he focused attention on strengthening its ties with the people and on educating cadres of workers and all communists in the spirit of the fight against bureaucratism. More than 40 years ago he already saw the danger of the party breaking away from the people's masses after coming to power, and therefore he insistently did everything he could to fight against this danger. Ho Chi Minh constantly repeated: We enter the party in order to be true servants of the people and not grandees.

Ho Chi Minh never reconciled himself to attempts to create a personality cult and never recognized any special rights or privileges for himself. He demanded of cadre workers and all communists: "Be disturbed about things before others are and take joy after others do"; be hard-working, thrifty, honest, fair, and absolutely selfless. A modest and simple way of life is not only a clear example for others but it should also be a measure of the moral qualities and behavior of members of the ruling party. He thought that the party's highest interest consisted in that "it should always be concerned about the life of the people, and every cadre worker and communist should love the people and really respect their right to be the masters of the country."

The revolution is a great and new cause, and therefore no single party can be guaranteed against mistakes and shortcomings. It is important for the party to look the truth boldly in the eye, to deal with criticism from the people with real respect, and to resolutely overcome mistakes and shortcomings. President Ho Chi Minh said: "A party that covers up its shortcomings can be considered dead. But a party that boldly admits and clearly names its shortcomings, points out the causes and circumstances for their appearance, and looks for various ways of overcoming them, is a progressive, reliable, and real party!"

After Vietnam won its independence and freedom Ho Chi Minh selected the socialist path of development. This was a substantiated choice that corresponded to the aspirations and interests of the Vietnamese people. It was substantiated because it was based on the profound life experience of President Ho Chi Minh and his knowledge of the barbarian and perverse essence of colonialism and imperialism and the hidden sides of the capitalist society. This choice corresponds to the major tendencies of the age as revealed by Great October—an age of transition from capitalism to socialism. Naturally, as a new stage in history it is winding, complicated, rich in a diversity of forms, and fraught with temporary and local defeats. We were and are witnesses to the struggle in this transitional stage which is taking place on all continents of our planet, we are witnesses not to the "downfall" but to the self-renewal of socialism. In spite of the fact that in certain places socialism has sustained some losses, history is still developing according to the laws revealed by historical materialism.

The socialist choice corresponds to the call of the heart of the Vietnamese which, like our beloved President Ho Chi Minh, has traveled the path from patriotism to a socialist consciousness. For a people who have withstood the suffering of the colonial yoke and for 30 years have fought against imperialism, this path was the only logical one.

Communists and all the people of Vietnam today are implementing the decisions of the 6th Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam. Renewing real socialism in Vietnam, we have achieved our first encouraging results. The reforms in Vietnam should lead to new successes if we persistently continue socialist construction and assimilate well and creatively apply Marxism-Leninism and the ideas, moral principles, and work style of Ho Chi Minh and steadily maintain the leading role of the party—the vanguard of the working class, the one that expresses the interests of the workers and all the community of nations and nationalities in the country.

We support the perestroyka that is going on in the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries, but we feel bitterness about the disturbances that have occurred in a number of countries of East Europe. At the same time we are convinced that imperialism and antisocialist forces will not be able to reverse the wheel of history.

President Ho Chi Minh devoted his entire life to the revolutionary cause of the Vietnamese people and the peoples of the entire world. He led a brilliant and heroic life, one that was filled with difficulties and deprivations but was noble, vital, bright, and excellent. He brought to Vietnam freedom, independence, and unification of the homeland. He was the creator of a new age in Vietnam—the age of Ho Chi Minh, the age of a happy and full life.

The revolutionary Ho Chi Minh linked all of his long life to the Soviet Union, the country of Lenin and the home of the Great October Revolution. He always considered friendship with the Soviet Union to be the dictate of his heart. He said: "A Vietnamese saying goes: 'When you drink water remember the source.' The more the working class and the people of Vietnam think about their difficult, degrading, and indentured past, about the various stages in the tormenting and self-sacrificing struggle which at the same time was filled with brilliant victories, the more deeply they are aware of all they owe Lenin and the October Revolution."

Celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Ho Chi Minh, the Vietnamese people are filled with resolve to carry out his behests and realize his noble dreams.

Near East & South Asia

Egypt's Mubarak Viewed as 'Prominent Leader'

WA3005184690 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 12 May 90 p 3

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA international correspondent Vladimir Mikhaylov: "The Leader With Legible Handwriting: Awaiting the Visit of Egyptian President Husni Mubarak to the Soviet Union"]

[Text] Discussing the policies of President Husni Mubarak, Muhammad Haykal, one of the most famous journalists of the Arab world, stressed that although many people consider Mubarak to be indecisive, this is far from the case. His policy in the overwhelming majority of instances is mindful of "the caution of an experienced pilot who requires all necessary information prior to taking off."

When during the military parade in Cairo, Tuesday 6 October 1981 at 1140 hours, a group of conspirators opened fire on the reviewing stand where Sadat was seated, Vice President Muhammad Husni Sayyid Mubarak was sitting at his right hand. He was not saved by accident—the conspirators in the assassination declared to a man that only "the traitor Sadat" had been condemned to death.

One week later, Husni Mubarak took hold of the reins of the government of one of the most prominent states of the "third world." But one would not readily envy the legacy he had been left—a collapsed economy, monstrous foreign debt, massive discontent of millions of his half-starving countrymen, a vassal-like dependence on the United States, and Egypt's complete isolation from the Arab world following Sadat's capitulation before

Israel. In short, there existed practically no positive factors which might assist the new president, if only in taking his very first steps.

Was Mubarak prepared to take on such a heavy load as had been thrust upon his shoulders? "My entire life has been a chain of unexpected events," he stated on one occasion, although generally very uncomfortable talking about himself. "How many times I have received a new mission and felt—this is my destiny, but each time something new was in store."

Husni Mubarak was born 4 May 1928 in a landowner's family of average means, whose sons chose to pursue state service or become military officers. He completed military college with distinction in 1949, went to pilot school, and began service on the Sinai Peninsula at the El-Arish military airfield, where he met Sadat for the first time. But Mubarak was too young and "free officers" did not allow him into their group. It was apparent, however, that the young pilot was already noticed, being in the first group of officers sent by Gamal Abdel Nasser in 1957 to the Soviet Union for training.

When civil war broke out in North Yemen in 1962, he was sent there to take part in combat operations. Here he demonstrated not only expertise but personal courage as well. Then he returned to the Soviet Union, where he studied the particular features of supersonic bombers. He was a good student and received "excellent" grades on all examinations. Following the Israeli aggression of June 1967, when Egypt lost most of its aircraft, Colonel Mubarak was commissioned to participate in the restoration and restructuring of the Air Force. He became director of the Military Air Academy.

Studying new combat aircraft, again and again he analyzed the painful lessons of the war. President al-Nasir followed the academy's operation personally and was satisfied with the training process established there. A year prior to his death, al-Nasir promoted Mubarak to general and appointed him Air Force chief of staff. Three years later, in spring of 1972, the future president would become commander in chief of the Air Force and, simultaneously, deputy minister of defense. The new appointment enabled him to prepare Egyptian aviation for the October 1973 war, following which he was awarded the title of aviation marshal. Sadat personally conferred upon him the "Star of the Sinai," Egypt's highest military decoration.

These were not just steps along the path of a military career. The profession of combat pilot inculcated presence of mind, proper judgment, the ability to avoid making hasty decisions when there remained time to think. The job forced one to be well-disciplined and capable of managing a tremendous number of subordinates. It sharpened organizational qualities. Thus, from a military officer not especially concerned with politics, Mubarak was gradually forged into a future chief of state.

A certain curious incident is well known. During the "war of nerves," Mubarak became suspicious by virtue of the fact that the enemy was too well-informed concerning what was taking place in Egypt's Air Force headquarters. So, under the strictest secrecy, he informed his closest advisers that he had decided at such-and-such a time to conduct a combat operation against the Israelis. The alarm was sounded in the Israeli Armed Forces at the hour he had designated, and it became clear that either a traitor or an irresponsible chatterer was hiding among his senior officers. An investigation was conducted which confirmed this.

Mubarak became vice president of the country in 1975, a fact which caused bewilderment in the highest Cairo circles. But the fact of the matter is that Sadat's policies entailed selecting an individual unexpectedly and advancing him into the inner circle over the heads of those who were closest. In this way he would be able to obligate the fortunate person, forcing his personal devotion.

Although practically no one, not even Mubarak's adherents, considered the new star on the political horizon to be a particularly brilliant individual, journalists soon began to note the organizational abilities, smartness, and restraint of the "military man in civilian clothes," his lack of any aspiration to flaunt himself. When Sadat conducted negotiations, Mubarak sat next to the president but hardly entered into the conversation. It is said that when Henry Kissinger met Mubarak for the first time, he took him for Sadat's personal secretary and was more than slightly embarrassed upon realizing his blunder. Qualities not usually observed in the Egyptian hierarchy of that period also came rapidly to public attention—a high level of culture and education, efficiency, and honesty.

It is this kind of person who took over the helm of a sick Egypt in October 1981. He began by doing what should be done—let us say it straight out. During the first three months Mubarak attempted in every way possible to diffuse the heat of passions which had run high during the years of Sadat's rule. He delivered his program address at a popular assembly. Unusually brief, yet saturated with content, it made a profound impression. Speaking about domestic policy and the economic situation, the president stated his support for the establishment of new job positions and the construction of inexpensive housing; he somewhat carefully criticized doors "opened too wide," which enabled a "clique of exploiters" to get rich on the people's hardships. Everyone turned attention to his energetic phrase: "There cannot be social peace in Egypt without the creation of the requisite base."

Mubarak saw one of his most important tasks as being the eradication of corruption and wasteful spending in government. He declared that neither high-ranking position nor past service would be taken into account with regard to a government embezzler who was apprehended. "The law reigns supreme over everything and everyone. The law is above individuals no matter who they may be," the president stressed.

Actions followed words—directed against "fat cats." On the direct instruction of Mubarak, Sadat's brother Ismat and his sons, directors of major swindling operations, and other thieves in high positions were brought to trial. The judicial proceedings conducted against them demonstrated once again the president's resoluteness in eliminating corruption in Egyptian society. It was primarily his scrupulous character in things of this kind which enabled him to fight corruption out in the open, a factor which causes ordinary Egyptians to refer to him to this day as "Mr. Integrity."

Occupying the president's chair, Mubarak set free political prisoners who had been thrown behind bars by his predecessor. He shook hands with several well-known figures brought to him directly from prison. He received opposition leaders Ibragim Shukri and Khaled Mokhi al-Din, and promised to consult with them in the future regarding all the most important issues. In just a year's time, representatives of the Egyptian press—under government control—told their foreign colleagues it had been a very long time since they were able to feel as free as they did at present.

Following Husni Mubarak's address in the parliament, the newspapers as usual sounded his praise, extolling the leader's wisdom and genius. Also in accordance with established ritual, state and private firms placed half- or full-page notices of a universally eulogistic nature; telegrams poured in to the president.

Mubarak reacted swiftly and unambiguously. He went on radio and television to ask that this "unworthy game" be brought to an end. "Let Egyptian citizens work—and not spend their energy and initiative to no avail on such laudatory hymns," he declared roughly.

The new president was not about to throw dirt on his predecessor, or even work on dissociating himself from him—he simply acted. Mubarak did not disavow the "special" relationship with the United States, but replied "No" to the U.S. request to permit construction of a naval base on the Red Sea. He did not cut off relations with Israel, but structured them so as to be maintained at a very modest level. At the same time, Mubarak conducted a firm policy toward renewing relations with the Soviet Union. Diplomatic relations between the two countries were fully normalized in 1984, following which trade and economic relations began to develop. Today the first visit of an Egyptian leader to the USSR in 18 years is planned.

Let no one suppose that extricating the country from its quandary went smoothly and evenly. After some degree of satisfaction was seen in the new president's first steps, there came the onset of hard times, disorder, an absence of political unanimity, serious economic shocks, and antigovernment statements. But Husni Mubarak was able to do what few believed he could—to lift the country out of its quagmire. It cannot be said that the Egyptian people today are living comfortably. But their situation is in no way comparable to that of their recent past.

In 1988, for the first time in a very long while, the flags of the Arab countries began to wave over their embassies in Cairo. And just a year later the Egyptian president began more and more frequently to appear as a prominent leader in the Near East, in Africa, and even in the world arena. Mubarak's diplomatic initiative, a peace plan for settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and recognition of the state of Palestine, gained such popularity for him that he was selected chairman of the Organization of African Unity at the end of June of last year. Then quite recently a meeting took place between the presidents of Egypt and Syria which the Arab press termed "historic." Relations between the two countries, broken in 1977 after Sadat's trip to Jerusalem, were reestablished last December. At the very beginning of May, Husni Mubarak visited Damascus at the invitation of H. Assad. Perhaps not even the journalists who covered the course of this meeting realized that it was not just two leaders of states at odds with each other until quite recently, but old friends who were discoursing—former pilots who had served at the same air base when Egypt and Syria were the United Arab Republic, and classmates as well at the Military Academy imeni M.V. Frunze in Moscow....

After assuming his position, Husni Mubarak was asked what policy he would be pursuing—al-Nasir's or Sadat's. Mubarak's short reply: "My own."

Gorbachev Talk With India's Singh Reviewed

BK3105145390 Moscow in Hindi to India 1130 GMT 30 May 90

[Yevgeniy Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, as you are aware, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev had a telephone conversation with Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh on 28 May. The two exchanged views on current international developments in light of the forthcoming U.S.-Soviet summit. The Soviet news agency, TASS, reported that the discussion was held in an atmosphere of openness and mutual understanding. There is really no need to explain the significance of talks between Indian and Soviet leaders. The opinions of a major peace-loving nation and the respectable leader of the Nonaligned Movement—India—have always been highly valued. The mutual influence of the policies of the Soviet Union and India and their cooperation in international forums have become constructive and effective factors in international politics. Indian-Soviet cooperation gave birth to an extremely important document of the new political thinking, the Delhi Declaration, based on the idea of a nuclear-and-violence-free world. Without its new approach on the preservation of life on earth, the coordination between the first treaty for nuclear disarmament and the political resolution of regional conflicts would not have been possible.

The improvement in the global political environment, inspired by the U.S.-Soviet summits, is the result of the collective endeavors of India and other Asian nations, and the world in general. China, India, and other nations of the Asia-Pacific region wish the forthcoming U.S.-Soviet summit success in achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament, and in other fields. The U.S.-Soviet antiballistic missiles treaty has greatly benefited the densely populated Asian continent. Now, the people in this part of the world expect that an agreement will be reached on the question of far-reaching cuts in strategic arms during the forthcoming summit of the presidents of the United States and Soviet Union. Many powerful weapons of this kind have been located on U.S. military bases in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and many have been installed on U.S. naval ships patrolling the area. The Soviet Union, India, and other Asian nations believe that disarmament, good-neighborliness, and the building of confidence alone can ensure security in this region.

The time-tested Indian-Soviet friendly relations show how advantageous close cooperation between nations of two different political and social systems can be. These relations are in the interest of our two nations and are not in any way directed against the legitimate interests of other nations. Indian-Soviet cooperation does not impede the development of either country's relations with other countries. This has been proven by the normalization of Sino-Soviet and Sino-Indian relations. This type of cooperation widens the scope for the development of constructive tendencies in Asia and increases the possibility of resolving regional conflicts. The Soviet Union highly values India's contributions toward the signing of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan, and toward international efforts to help end the Iran-Iraq war and resolve the Cambodian conflict.

Regional conflicts are also discussed at U.S.-Soviet summits. This is natural because the development of international events depends largely on the prevailing situation in various regions, including Asia. Regional crises and problems figured prominently in the recent talks U.S. Secretary of State James Baker had with Soviet leaders, and will be considered during the forthcoming U.S.-Soviet summit.

The people of South Asian nations and other countries hope that the escalation of tension in Indian-Pakistani relations will be discussed at the U.S.-Soviet Washington summit. A senior U.S. official remarked at a 24 May news briefing at the White House that a discussion on this issue is possible. He described the emerging situation in the Indian subcontinent as the biggest danger looming over the horizon. The Indian and Pakistani newspapers, while talking of the possibility of a new war, express similar sentiments. If war breaks out, such a development of events would be against the interests of both India and Pakistan and also against the cause of regional and global stability. Nobody in the world would welcome a new war in South Asia. The entire world is tired of rivalry and meaningless regional disputes. The people of the world are becoming increasingly convinced that dialogue, not military confrontation, between concerned parties is the only way to end regional tension. This is true for Pakistan and India as well. The Soviet policy in this regard is crystal clear. This policy was reiterated at a Moscow news briefing on 28 May when Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev stated that the Soviet Union wants to see a peaceful, political settlement of Indian-Pakistani differences through bilateral negotiations on the basis of the Simla Agreement and without any outside interference.

Pakistani-Backed Acts in Afghanistan Denounced

LD3105223490 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS news analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—Afghan field commanders of armed rebel detachments, who are on the payroll of the Pakistani intelligence service, received an order from Pakistan's interdepartmental intelligence agency (ISI) to shoot down Aeroflot planes delivering food products and prime necessities for the population of Kabul.

Reporting about this at a news conference in Kabul on Wednesday [30 May] Ghulam Sarwar Yurish, head of the press department of the Afghan president, referred to ISI instructions code-named Star-2 obtained from the hands of field commanders.

They envisage a set of measures to increase military pressure on the Afghan Government and civilian population, including the intensification of missile bombardments of large settlements, especially Kabul.

The new ISI instructions are the escalation of the selfsame policy of criminal actions meant to demoralise the population with the help of terror and acts of subversion, block the supply of private necessities to the people of the war-ravaged Afghanistan, hamper Afghans to overcome economic havoc, deprivations and hunger, and stymie the government's efforts to restore normal life in the country.

It will be recalled that approximately a year ago, the opposition die hards, encouraged by Pakistan and the United States, launched organised attempts to thwart the supply of consumer goods from Termez in the Soviet Union and the Pakistani city of Islamabad.

Columns of trucks with the U.N. flag and emblem, loaded with medicines, fertilisers and wheat, were repeatedly attacked and looted by gangs of Hekmatyar and other leaders of the Afghan opposition. An aircraft of the U.N. Good Offices Mission (UNGOMAP) was the target of their terror last September.

It is an open secret who supplies missiles to Afghanistan and directs the hand of those who uses the deadly weapons against residents of Afghan cities and settlements.

Despite repeated calls by the Afghan and Soviet sides, in Islamabad they do not make any attempts to prevent crimes perpetrated by rebels and, moreover, are seen to encourage this terrorist activity.

More and more facts of actions hostile to the Soviet Union and its citizens, in which the Pakistani intelligence service is involved, become public knowledge. The latest order by the ISI is fresh evidence of this.

The Soviet Union warned on several occasions that it would give all necessary aid to the Afghan Government in its efforts to stop rebels' barbarous raids.

It reserves for itself the right to take all measures, which it deems expedient, to ensure the security of its citizens, whether this applies to pilots delivering humanitarian aid to the population of Kabul, specialists extending assistance to the Afghan people, or diplomats.

Retaliatory measures of the immediate and most decisive nature, agreed upon with the Afghan Government, will be taken against them.

East Europe

Vorobyev on Progress of Withdrawal From CSFR

LD3105142590 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] On 31 May the first stage of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Czechoslovakia is drawing to an end. Our military affairs correspondent, Vadim Solovyev, has interviewed the commander of the Soviet contingent in Czechoslovakia, Colonel-General Eduard Vorobyev.

Characteristic of this stage, Gen. Vorobyev said, is the stability with which the agreed withdrawal schedule is implemented. Even if there are certain shortcomings, they are of no principled importance. Though we have to work very intensively—the withdrawal is going on round the clock and without any days off—we are certain that the work will be completed in accordance with the schedule.

We have already pulled out, Gen. Vorobyev went on, 25,000 servicemen, 551 tanks, 859 troop carriers, 440 artillery pieces and mortars, 22 rocket launchers, and 92 helicopter gunships. The joint coordinated actions of the Czechoslovak bodies of authority and the Soviet side help meet the targets of the withdrawal plan. The Czechoslovak side sees to it that the rail stock be brought in time and ensures the safety of the car convoys' movement, said Gen. Vorobyev.

As far as problems and difficulties of the withdrawal are concerned, they do arise, Gen. Vorobyev said, and he continued; the main problem is the irregular supply of the rolling stock on Soviet territory, the general said. As a result cargoes accumulate on the Soviet transshipping station. This problem was solved through opening an additional railway route that runs via the territory of the Polish Republic. Another problem is that the Soviet contingent in Czechoslovakia had 5,408 facilities at its disposal, half of which had been built at the Soviet Union's expense and are consequently the Soviet Union's property. Towns where the troops were quartered are handed over to the Czechoslovak side after corresponding protocols are drawn. But essential diferences arise between the Soviet and the Czechoslovak commissions when they estimate the cost of the facilities and set the sums that are to be deducted from the exploitation of the leased quarters or structures. Representatives of the USSR Ministry for Foreign Economic Contacts arranged the selling of the facilities owned by the Soviet Union, the commander of the Soviet contingent in Czechoslovakia, Gen. Eduard Vorobyev, said in conclusion.

Data Cited on Withdrawal

PM3105172990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 First Edition p 8

[Dispatch by own special correspondent V. Izgarshev: "Return: First Stage of Soviet Troop Withdrawal From Czechoslovakia Coming to an End"]

[Excerpt] Prague—Moscow—Formations and units of the Soviet Army will be returning home from Czechoslovakia. Some will be disbanded, others will continue their service. In all 73,500 personnel, 1,220 tanks, 2,505 combat vehicles, 1,218 artillery pieces, 77 combat aircraft, 146 combat helicopters, and other military equipment will be withdrawn. [passage omitted]

Landbergis' 'Private Visit' to CSFR Noted

PM3105223090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent L. Kornilov: "Landsbergis in Prague"]

[Text] Prague—V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, arrived in Prague Wednesday [30 May] at the personal invitation of Czechoslovak President V. Havel. As is stressed here, this is a purely private visit which will enable the Czechoslovak leadership to obtain firsthand information about the prevailing situation.

Landsbergis spent the evening over an amicable supper with President Havel. Before that he had been received by Czechoslovak Foreign Minister J. Dienstbier. During the two conversations it was said that Czechoslovakia supports Lithuania's aspiration to independence and sovereignty.

Landsbergis also spoke on the television program "Events and Commentary." To a correspondent who asked "Why is Czechoslovakia the first foreign state you have visited?" Landsbergis replied: "No, this is the second visit—my first trip abroad was to Estonia."

West Europe

Thatcher Plans Official Visit 7-10 Jun

LD3106231490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 31 May 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Gorbachev's visit [to the United States] continues until 4 June and then in three days' time Gorbachev will have a meeting with Margaret Thatcher. It was officially announced today in London that Thatcher will visit Moscow, Kiev, and Leninakan from 7-10 June.

Gorbachev Congratulates Portugual's Cunhal

LD3005165490 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev has congratulated Alvaro Cunhal on being reelected gerneral secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party.

The congratulatory message pointed out that the Soviet Communist Party has maintained relations of solidarity with the Portuguese Communist Party for a long time. Gorbachev wished Alvaro Cunhal success in his work for the benefit of the Portuguese people, in the interests of democracy and socialism.

French Chief of Staff Schmitt Interviewed

PM3005105990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 May 90 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Army General Maurice Schmitt, chief of staff of the French Armed Forces, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Major M. Pogorelyy: "Right to Security"—date and place of interviewnot specified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] As already reported, Army General Maurice Schmitt, chief of staff of the French Armed Forces, has paid an official visit to the Soviet Union. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Major M. Pogorelyy met with him and asked him to answer a number of questions.

[Pogorelyy] Mr. General, are the French military-political leadership's views of security problems changing in connection with the radical transformations in East Europe?

[Schmitt] It is true that great changes are taking place in Europe. The process of overcoming the split in our continent is developing, and we are glad of this. Nevertheless, it is still necessary to guarantee peace and stability in Europe. That is the essence of our defense concept. France cleaves to and will continue to cleave to the principle of reasonable sufficiency both in the sphere of nuclear weapons and also in the conventional arms sphere. As for conventional arms, we attach great significance to the successful completion of the Vienna talks, and France will, of course, make the agreed cuts.

[Pogorelyy] If a USSR-U.S. treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms is signed, will France follow the two powers' example?

[Schmitt] We believe that the U.S. and Soviet strategic arsenals considerably exceed the level required for deterrence. We want the arsenals to be cut by 50 percent in line with the planned goals as a result of the strategic offensive arms talks. When this result has been secured, there will still be considerable disproportions: You and the Americans will have at least 6,000 warheads, whereas we will have only a few hundred. There can be no comparison here: "The proportions are quite out of proportion," as the French president has said.

[Pogorelyy] What is the attitude in French military circles to the current rapid process of German unification?

[Schmitt] At a press conference in 1962 General de Gaulle said: "The division of Germany is an anomaly." People in France welcome the emerging process of German unification. After all, the division of any country is a source of injustice and threatens stability and peace. We must do everything we can to ensure that German unification is a factor for stability in Europe and the strengthening of peace. I believe that the best way to achieve this is for a united Germany to be a member of the North Atlantic alliance.

[Pogorelyy] Incidentally, let us say a word about France's role within this bloc. The desire on both sides—both the Warsaw Pact and NATO—to reduce the level of confrontation in Europe and develop political dialogue is now obvious. At the same time France advocates consolidating the "European group" as the foundation of NATO. What is the reason for this, in your view?

[Schmitt] France has always endeavored to relax tension in East-West relations. The role that it played in the process of convening the CSCE is proof of this. We attach tremendous importance to the successful completion of the Vienna talks on conventional forces in Europe and to the development of confidence- and security-building measures. Stability requires the preservation of a certain degree of equilibrium and in this context France is committed to the idea of a European group of this kind within NATO as the foundation of security in West Europe

[Pogorelyy] The idea of the "Soviet military threat" was loudly preached in the West for a long time. Claims about this have virtually disappeared from speeches made by responsible politicians and military leaders now. Do you think that this is a political gambit or recognition of present-day realities?

[Schmitt] Every state has the right to security and this is its duty to its people. President Gorbachev sets out this opinion in his book "Perestroyka," and we share this opinion. We have noted with great satisfaction that Soviet leaders adhere to a defensive doctrine and are manifesting great interest in the concept of minimum deterrence. Nevertheless, we must take the reality of current military potentials into consideration.

[Pogorelyy] Mr. General, we were allies during World War II. Do you think that there is a chance of establishing closer and more lasting contacts between the French and Soviet Armed Forces today?

[Schmitt] The French people have not forgotten the brotherhood in arms that took shape between our peoples both during World War I and in the struggle against fascism during World War II. Like Soviet people, we are celebrating the 45th anniversary of the elimination of Nazism. But this does not mean that we still nurture our former hostility toward the Germans; we have been carrying out a policy of reconciliation for several decades now.

You raised the question of developing Soviet-French military relations. In July 1989 General Moiseyev and I signed an agreement on relations between the Soviet and French Armed Forces. My presence here, the two French Navy ships' visit to Sevastopol, and the visit paid to France by a delegation from the Soviet airborne assault troops are clear examples of the real development of ties between our armed forces. I am glad that these contacts are the foundation needed to develop trust between our countries, and I am convinced that military men are playing a significant role here.

[Pogorelyy] So is your present visit purely ceremonial, or is it a truly useful exchange of opinions, a working meeting?

[Schmitt] I would say that it is both. Ceremonial visits also "work" to develop mutual understanding and help find a common language for discussion. At the same time I had three meetings with General Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff, during which we exchanged our opinions of events in Europe and discussed concrete ways to close the gap with regard to a number of positions held by our countries and NATO and the Warsaw Pact as a whole. Thus I consider this visit to be useful.

Bundestag Decision on W. Berlin Deputies Viewed

PM2905110390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[Correspondent Stanislav Zyubanov report: "Rushing Ahead?: Implication of the Bundestag Decision"]

[Text] West Berlin, 24 May—All the local newspapers carried the Bundestag's decision today: West Berliners have been given the right to directly elect 16 deputies to the FRG Parliament. What are the implications of this decision? Let us investigate. As is well known, in accordance with West Berlin's special status its municipal assembly (parliament), acting on the recommendations of the political parties, has so far sent 22 deputies to the Bundestag where they have no voting right.

The new Bundestag decision infringes on the very status of West Berlin and flagrantly undermines it. The direct election of West Berlin deputies would give the city the same standing as the FRG Lands and would be a violation of the 1971 four-power agreement on West Berlin on three important points at the same time. First, it would violate the crucial provision of the treaty that West Berlin does not belong to the FRG and cannot be administered by it. Second, it would break the commitment of the parties to the agreement on the renunciation of unilateral changes to the existing position. And third, it would flout the provision on the immediate cessation in the western sectors of Berlin of all actions which violate the city's special status.

Of course, changing the provisions of the four-power agreement or revoking it entirely is the priority of the signatories, namely the USSR, the United States, Britain, and France, and not the FRG Bundestag. In that sense the decision by that country's supreme legislative body is invalid. But some Bonn politicians would like the "German reunification train" to go so fast that it sweeps away at a stroke all the treaties and restrictions which resulted from World War II. In rushing ahead like this they want to present the participants in the "two plus four" talks with a fait accompli.

In so doing, Bonn cites the verbal agreement of the Western allies on this question and points to the absence "at the moment" of a written note from the United States, Britain, and France, patently ignoring the opinion of the fourth main partner in the anti-Hitler coalition—the Soviet Union.

No wonder then that a commentator in BERLINER MORGENPOST has grave doubts: "Would it not be better," he writes, "to wait for a while before instituting the direct election of Bundestag deputies from West Berlin with a right to vote until the Soviet Union, as the fourth victorious power, gives at least its unofficial consent."

As far as I am aware, our country has not given its consent to such dangerous actions which undermine stability in central Europe. On the contrary, the representatives of the United States, Britain, and France have received through diplomatic channels the USSR's negative opinion on Bonn's attempts to institute the direct election by West Berlin residents of their deputies to the FRG Bundestag.

There is no doubt that the Bundestag's decision will create extra difficulties for the "two plus four" talks and will cause confusion on the question of West Berlin's status.

Food Delivery Problems From FRG Explained

PM3005142490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 90 Morning Edition p 6

[A. Balandin report: "Across the Transport Thresholds: On Food Deliveries From the FRG for the Soviet Union"]

[Text] Bonn—We are satisfied with the course of fulfillment of the accords reached on deliveries of food products to the USSR, Ministerial Director R. Genske, head of department at the FRG Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry, has stated.

Let me remind you that it is a question of food products purchased by the Soviet Union at world prices in European Community countries for a total of more than 510 million FRG Deutschmarks. An agreement to this effect between the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and the aforementioned FRG federal ministry was signed 8 February this year. It was one link in a chain of developing economic ties between our countries, in the spirit of the 13 June 1989 joint Soviet-West German statement, signed during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the FRG.

Under the agreement, more than 100,000 tonnes of beef and hog meat, 20,000 tonnes of butter, 15,000 tonnes of dried whole milk, and 2,000 tonnes of canned meat are to be delivered to the Soviet Union. A significant addition to our tables, especially in view of the fact that in this case Bonn has also pledged to pay the USSR a subsidy of FRG DM220 million.

Our Western partners are businesslike people. As soon as the agreement was signed, a whole regiment of supply firms declared themselves, headed by the West German firm Moksel [as transliterated]. Specific delivery dates were also set for between March and the end of May.

Let us explain immediately that these dates were not adhered to, and it was necessary to hold another round of talks. As a result the date of the final deliveries was put back to the end of August.

What happened? What were the reasons for the breakdown? Let us begin by saying that a mass outbreak of disease among cattle came to light in Britain recently. Fearing a spread of the epidemic to other West European countries, the Soviet veterinary service, together with foreign colleagues, organized careful checking of meat products. Fortunately everything proved to be in order—no contamination was found. It is possible to discuss the timing and organization of the check, but that is a matter for the specialists. There can be no doubt as to the necessity for it. The reason is objective.

A second factor affecting the delivery dates was a range of transportation problems. It is well known that our railroads are a different gauge from those in the West. Even if our freightcars' trucks are replaced, the refrigerator cars, given their dimensions, cannot use Western lines. It was necessary to resort to reloading the goods at Brest and Chop. And here there were plenty of difficulties: Either there were not enough freightcars, or they were not supplied on time, or there was no one to do the loading.

The owners of the Western refrigerator cars protested: After all, a refrigerator on wheels is not the permafrost zone, and dry ice has a tendency to melt. The danger that the food products would spoil became increasingly real. These complications could have been predicted beforehand. There is no shortage of information about the throughput capacity of our railroads. There is hardly likely to be anything new to add. But the losses would have been at our expense.

In the end this problem was also resolved—water transport and additional road transport was brought in. Now, I was assured at the USSR trade mission in the FRG and at the West German Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry, the schedule will be met. Butter deliveries will be completed by the end of May. The canned meats have already been dispatched in full, as well as more than half of the meat purchased.

For both sides this was a useful lesson in dealing with a whole range of complex questions and mutual agreements and establishing direct contacts between firms, R. Genske said. Of course, he added, it would be better if there were fewer formalities. We hope that in future deals both partners will take all the shortcomings into account and try to avoid them.

So figures have been named, schedules determined, and the delivery mechanism is running smoothly. But for the ordinary buyer, what matters is the opportunity to buy all this in the stores. This is up to our trade system. The distribution of goods within USSR territory, as I. Korneyev, USSR deputy trade representative in the FRG, explained, is the concern of "Prodintorg"—in accordance with the Trade Ministry's schedule of allocations.

Whether the Union's internal services will now be able to deal promptly with the influx, the immediate future will tell. So while sharing, to some degree, the optimism of Mr. R. Genske and our specialists, let us wait for the end result—the customers' assessment.

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Carries 31 May Supreme Soviet Session

LD3105210390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1950 GMT on 31 May begins carrying a recorded relay of the 31 May USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1950 GMT Lukyanov opens the proceedings. An unidentified deputy then reviews various proposals on amendments to the draft Law on the Status of People's Deputies.

At 2002 GMT the announcer says that the deputies then voted on various articles of the draft law on the status of people's deputies.

At 2003 GMT Desyatov and other deputies are shown discussing the nature of the term "mandate" and whether the deputies' duty is to fulfil their mandates from the voters or to enact legislation.

At 2009 GMT Lukyanov refers to Article 102 of the USSR Constitution on the subject of deputies' mandates, and points out that the Constitution is still in force. Deputies Oleynik, Bronshteyn, and others note that time is being wasted through the efforts of deputies to fulfil their unrealistic mandates.

At 2021 GMT the article on mandates is adopted by vote with the wording proposed by the drafting committee.

At 2025 GMT after a vote on another article, Lukyanov states that the Law on the Status of USSR People's Deputies is thus passed.

At 2027 GMT the announcer says that proceedings will continue on 1 June.

Supreme Soviet Adopts Bill on Status of Deputies

LD3105164190 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 31 May 90

[By Tass Parliamentary Correspondents Andrey Orlov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, May 31 (TASS)—The Soviet parliament today adopted a bill on the status of people's deputies, which enters into force from the moment of publication.

Under the new law, a deputy has the right to raise issues of confidence in the government and submit proposals for hearing a report from any body or official subordinate to the Conrgess of People's Deputies or the Supreme Soviet.

The law gives deputies the right of legislative initiative and contains the basic guarantees of their activity: the right to meet any official, the right to demand the rectification of any breaches of legality, and the right to receive and distribute information.

The law fixes a procedure for an investigation at deputies' demand. It may be carried out at the decision of the Congress or the Supreme Soviet and their bodies, or on the initiative of a group of not less than 100 people's deputies.

All state bodies and officials are obliged to provide necessary information and documents at the demand of a USSR people's deputy or a commission of deputies, engaged in the investigation.

The law stipulates that a deputy cannot be taken to court, arrested or subjected to administrative punishment without the prior consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Criminal proceedings against a people's deputy can be instituted only by the USSR prosecutor-general.

At a joint sitting of its two houses on Friday [1 June] the Supreme Soviet will discuss the second reading of the bill on the socialist enterprise.

Debate Shows Support for Government Market Plan

PM3105102790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by parliamentary correspondent Yu. Ursov: "Search For Accord"]

[Text] It is interesting to trace the changing tone during the four days of discussion at the USSR Supreme Soviet session of the government's report on the transition to a regulated market economy. At first there was strong opposition to many of the government's proposals. Then more restrained assessments began to appear in some speeches: Perhaps the USSR Council of Ministers experts' calculations are not that bad, as long as we are firmly resolved to organize the market. Finally, at yesterday's sitting we frequently heard speeches in which deputies supported the basic provisions of the government concept.

Let us stress that they came from speakers whom you would never accuse of being sympathetic toward the "bureaucratic apparatus." For example, Deputy N. Sazonov, who, he said, represents the Social Democratic Party, analyzed the government proposals in detail in his rather lengthy speech. As if responding to repeated demands to raise the question of confidence in the government, he said that then it is also necessary to raise the question of confidence in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Seemingly, no one supported the intention to increase food prices. Which made Deputy A. Chabanov's speech all the more unexpected. He totally endorsed this unpopular measure. It was not a speculative endorsement, but one that he based on specific economic calculations. Food price hikes, with maximum compensation for the population, are quite possible and justified. But while raising food prices, it is necessary to abandon the approximately R100 billion e subsidies for agriculture, some of which now go to support low-profitability farms rather than to the peasants. This sum would have to go direct to customers, so that they "vote with the ruble," choosing low-cost products produced by high-profitability farms.

A. Chabanov also made many apparently paradoxical proposals on price reform: Reduce liquor prices, do not raise car prices—the car production profit margin is big enough. All this combined with a range of other very important measures will make it possible to organize a balanced market. But for all the elements of the market mechanism to work, it is also necessary to alter the functions of the central economic organs. Deputy Yu. Krasilnikov had relevant things to say about this aspect of the transition to a market economy, one that, incidentally, had been largely ignored in the speeches.

When the debate ended USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov made the closing speech.

Then the discussion of the USSR Supreme Soviet draft resolution began. After a stormy debate, it was decided to spend a week modifying it.

Separate sittings of the chambers will take place today.

Commissioner Kucherenko on Transition to Market

PM3105120590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 90 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission, by unnamed own parliamentary correspondent under the "Response" rubric: "A Means Rather Than an End in Itself"—place and date e not given , first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The main political event of the past week in the country was undoubtedly the government report devoted to the problems of the transition to a regulated market economy delivered at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. A range of measures, including price rises, have been proposed to society. Well, we will have to pay for our many years of failure in the national economy. The main thing here is to ensure that this payment has an effect and creates a strong and balanced economy rather than being "frittered away," as was the case in the past.

Will it succeed? What will the transition to the market be like? PRAVDA's parliamentary correspondent asked V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Plannjng, Budget, and Finance Commission, to comment.

The fundamental question which the session will have to answer is the question of prices. Its resolution will determine whether we will choose the path to the market or whether we will mimic progress. I believe that it is impossible to switch to the market without changing wholesale and purchase prices. These no longer have any logic. But if we increase wholesale and purchase prices without altering retail prices, the economy will only last three to four months: After all, subsidies to agriculture would increase from R100 billion to R150 billion. Where would that money come from?

Of course, increasing prices is extremely unpleasant. But I think that increasing the bread price while providing full compensation will meet with understanding in society. Should we hold a nationwide referendum on increasing retail prices for other goods? I think that there is no need to waste time and effort; my answer would be in the negative. But it is extremely important to avoid long-term negative processes. This is only possible through a carefully constructed mechanism for switching to the market.

We need to eradicate all provisions which envisage tax and other breaks for state enterprises in a market system. The government's intention to set up a regional development fund out of compulsory payments by union republics and also from an equal percentage of national income, ratified by the Supreme Soviet, to provide incentives for regional development also requires serious analysis. Obviously, we should have such funds, but their aim and size, and the proportion of payments should be determined solely with the republics' agreement. Otherwise the situation will be reproduced in which the center, one way or another, shoulders all the commitments for territories' socioeconomic development.

In implementing the transition to the market, a great deal depends on members of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Complex decisions lie ahead for it.

Finally, social guarantees. When they meet with us workers say: It has been getting harder and harder for us to live over the past few years, and you're warning us that things will get even harder when you make certain decisions. They bluntly ask: Who needs this?

In this connection the Supreme Soviet, the USSR president, and the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers need to tell the people the whole truth about what lies in store for them.

Terrible forecasts have been circulating in the country for two years. These are keeping the people tense: Soon not only goods, but the stores, too, will be "swept away...."

One last point. The section covering social protection in the government program has been worked out in comparative detail. However, it is very vague about where the funds to pay for compensation will come from and how production will develop under these circumstances. Will there not be (as was the case in Poland) a 30-percent drop in the volume of production within a short period? You can imagine what this would mean for our country with its citizens' living standard.

We need the market, but not at any price. It is not an end in itself, it is a means to make people's lives abundant.

Political & Social

Ligachev Interviewed on Current Issues

LD3105155690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1545 GMT 30 May 90

["Topical Interview" with Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, CPSU Politburo member and Central Committee secretary, by radio correspondent Igor Zorin—recorded]

[Text] [Zorin] Yegor Kuzmich, let us, perhaps, start talking about the market economy. It is on everybody's lips today and, unfortunately, has maybe not prompted an appropriate reaction. You are a Politburo member. What are the tasks facing communists in conveying the meaning of this transition, proposed transition, to a market economy?

[Ligachev] First of all, I should like to say that I am for a socialist market. The issue of prices and the employment of the population are very important, but forms of ownership, the type of ownership, are the basis of any market. When people speak of a free market, that means that private ownership of the means of production are the basis of it. When we talk about the socialist market, that means that its basis is the type called socialist ownership, public ownership, of the means of production—I should like to stress, in all its diverse forms and forms of management, including state, collective, leasehold, co-operative....

[Zorin] Joint-stock.

[Ligachev] ...individual, joint-stock and so on. But, all the same, that is the basis of public ownership of the means of production.

Second, when I speak of the socialist market I also mean, first and foremost, a combination of the principle of the plan with commodity-money relations, the commodity-money economy. It is the plan which, I feel, should determine the main proportions of the development of the national economy and the economic stimulators—I would say regulators—of market and commodity-money relations. I am in favour of there definitely being, come what may, guaranteed prices for basic consumer goods....

[Zorin] State prices.

[Ligachev] Yes, state prices, and, without fail, guarantees against mass unemployment. No manner of material riches here, if they can be called that, can replace a person's need to engage in social production and the satisfaction of that need.

The measures for the transition to a regulated market economy have not yet been examined in the party's Central Committee. I feel that the party must be involved without delay both in the elaboration of these measures and especially in their implementation, of course. I feel that the implementation of any kind of profound reforms is completely impossible without the ruling party, as the Communist Party is. And all sorts of attempts to bypass the party and leave it somewhere on the sidelines are simply illusory, for under our system the party plays the leading role, especially in matters connected with explaining the essence of our policy to the people. You will agree that even the very best policy is condemned to failure if it is not understood by the people.

[Zorin] Economists consider that negative phenomena have been increasing in our economy since 1988. Hence, over three years it has proved impossible to improve anything in the economy using the old methods. What sort of new forms of economic management should be employed? In particular, you say that the country should not be transferred to a market economy; do I understand you correctly?

[Ligachev] No, I am talking about transfering to a socialist market, with guaranteed prices; I repeat once again, with guarantees against mass unemployment. This is my viewpoint. Now, answering your question, I would like to tell you this. I think that our mistake was precisely that we initiated the switch to extensive commodity-money relations and to market relations without proper preparations. Well, you will agree, that when we began transferring to contract relations in the national economy... [changes thought] after all, these are, essentially, market relations under our rigid, monopolistic system of national economy. Suppose I am a producer, you are a consumer. I am the only enterprise which manufactures this or that product. I enter into a certain relationship with you. It is bad that, despite, shall we say all my awareness, I dictate the price to you—whatever I consider necessary. In the final analysis you will be forced to purchase and acquire this item at this price. Given this situation, why should I pursue scientific and technical progress, if I know that the market is big enough for me as it is and that I have a monopoly in this business? At this cost I receive a high wholesale price and receive quite a high profit. I do not reinvest a significant portion of this profit in social production, but employ it mainly to increase the wage fund. This is the way that an enormous quantity of banknotes appeared on the market. After all, you can say what you like, but it was during these two years that income growth amounted to almost R100 billion. By the way, before this, income growth amounted to a maximum of R15-17 billion; usually, R10-15 billion.

Therefore, I think that it was precisely because we did not make sufficient legal, organizational or economic preparations that, so to speak, we have not managed to achieve the planned results. This is where our mistake lies.

[Zorin] You were in Belgorod Oblast recently and met communists in this region. What do you people on the spot say? What does the farmer say about government intentions to transfer our economy to market relations?

[Ligachev] I want to tell you that everbody is very concerned. Over the six days of my stay, during numerous meetings, I was asked over 900 questions. To tell you bluntly, if they were to be grouped together, then questions connected with the market economy were among the most common. People are concerned about prices, of course. They are not worried in the countryside about the question of work, well, because, as you know, they are suffering from a shortage of labor anyway. [Ligachev laughs] However, the question of prices, especially of consumer goods is of extreme concern, but the population is no less concerned about purchase prices, too.

As you know, at the March party Central Committee plenum we elaborated the foundations of current agrarian policy. The past year or more has confirmed that all this was done correctly. However, unfortunately, we have only just begun to decide such very important questions as the reform of purchase prices, the taxation of collective and state farms, and questions connected with the development of the credit system, as well as, of course, questions connected with the material and technical provision of agriculture and of collective and state farms.

However, we are now doing something. You know that the price of grain has been raised considerably—by 1.5 times. As for potatoes, let's say, vegetables and fruit, well, we have already gone over to contractual prices. This already concerns the heart of the matter, elements of market relations. The whole complex of purchase prices is being worked out now very intensively, as are wholesale and retail prices too. We are also working on questions connected with improving the quality of equipment, on increasing the quantity of certain equipment, on guaranteeing the population's supply of consumer goods and also of materials for the production sphere.

Incidentally, in a few days time we will hold a sitting of the Central Committee Agrarian Commission, and at that sitting we will examine, what is, in my opinion an extraordinarily important question, the question of the parity of prices of industrial output and agricultural produce, because, herein lies the key to the question. The prices of agricultural produce can be raised too, and, so to speak, raised rather high. However, if tomorrow there is an unrestrained price rise in agricultural equipment, as unfortuntely often happens, of mineral fertilizer, of all resources and construction materials used in the countryside, then naturally, this will come to naught; it will yield no result, apart from, so to speak, causing grievance and dissatisfaction in the countryside.

I would also like to comment on what you said about the mood of people there. I will say this to you, that on the whole, the mood is business-like. People are busy working. I am very glad to affirm, once again, that in our countryside people are not on strike, not holding rallies, but are just simply working. Therefore, over recent years, the agro-industrial complex has been growing, but the growth in foodstuffs is so slow, so slight that, as they say, it's difficult to speak of that, too. However, there is no drop in production, there is only growth.

I would like to add to what I have already said that I back price reform, the reform of all prices—wholesale, procurement and retail—and without fail this must be accompanied by nationwide discussion.

This means demonopolizing our economy. This means credit reform, and much else. But I want to reaffirm that the market is, primarily, a form and type of property. Depending on what type of property, what form of property, such is the market, too. Well, this is of fundamental importance.

[Zorin] Bread is the most important issue. Today, through party structures, you are head of the whole agricultural sphere of our country. Are you in favor of raising the price of bread?

[Ligachev] Undoubtedly, I (?would) even....

[Zorin, interrupting] Of bread and bread products?

[Ligachev] I think that our society is fully prepared for the implementation of this decision. Moreover, we know that the demand for this was put forward many years ago, and it ought to have been done then. Incidentally, that would have helped us, in the sense of the experience of reforming prices. Now, we (?have to take everything that is of value, then it would be possible to single out that product); society is prepared for that, but only under quite specific conditions, under social protection. That is to say, we must compensate those on low incomes—pensioners, veterans, students; in a word, all those on low wages. A certain amount of resources are needed so that it is painless, especially, to put it bluntly, as bread holds a special place for all the poorly paid, among whom consumption levels are higher. We must also take this into account. I am deeply convinced that if we raise prices, the attitude to bread will be more economical, more sensible. We will save, I think, not just one million tonnes of grain, but considerably more, for which we are now paying hard currency.

[Zorin] Yegor Kuzmich, well, I've been to the GDR, to Scandinavian countries. Bread is sold in small portions there, small pieces, in 100g, 200g, 300g portions, sliced and wrapped. Shouldn't we go over to that method? After all....

[Ligachev, interrupting] I think that's correct.

[Zorin] Well, it's a sin that you can go to a shop and half a loaf is too much and a quarter is too little. The bread industry ought to go over to a different method. (?as they say, to weighing.)

[Ligachev] Of course, we must transfer bread and bakery products.

[Ligachev] I think that increased prices will help here.

Finally I should like to say that the preparations for the congress are proceeding in three areas. On the one hand there are the issues connected analyzing the work already done. Then there is the development of the draft programs that are already being discussed in society and will be considered at the congress. The third area is overcoming the economic and social difficulties that have arisen in society.

[Zorin] Have you already got on to the future party congress?

[Ligachev] Yes, indeed. In connection with this attitude of mind I should like to convey the following: There is a most approving attitude in the countryside, especially on the part of the communists, to questions connected with the expansion of the rights of the primary party organizations. The new system of choosing delegates for the congress where indeed all communists and all the primary party organizations participate directly in the voting for congress delegates is being very well received. Once communists themselves without the numerous stages that existed previously are determining the composition of delegates, you will agree that they will influence the adoption of certain decisions at the congress. Incidentally they have expressed a wish regarding the delegates that are elected, the essence of which is that after the congress these delegates should permanently maintain relations with those party organizations and those communists who nominated and elected the comrades for the party congress.

[Zorin] Yegor Kuzmich, excuse me for interrupting you, but what was so unusual in the present party election campaign, when you stood for election to the 28th congress?

[Ligachev] There was a great deal that was unusual. First, there was the very high activity by the people. I got the impression that one only had to make an announcement and comrades would come along to a meeting. It was not a question of ensuring some kind of appearance. It was a question of finding suitable premises to accommodate the people at these meetings. That is the first point. Second, there was the very high level of political involvement by the people. You know, as a rule, there were many people at the meetings, although the meetings each lasted three or four hours. Usually the three of us who were contenders for election as deputy spoke for 10 minutes each. Usually, we, and I in particular, would answer questions for between two and two and a half hours. However, it was not only questions and—incidentally this was in general very characteristic—before asking any question the communist would without fail express his point of view on various issues. Only then would he ask his question. So to all intents and purposes there was a very broad exchange of opinions on the issues of most interest to people. I would say that there was broad democratism. Various categories of people spoke, including workers, collective farmers, intellectuals, young people, veterans and women. This broad range was, I would say, very pleasing.

[Zorin] Did they only praise you or did they criticize, too?

[Ligachev] No, it was not a case of the people expressing praise. Indeed, there were occasions [Ligachev chuckles] when there was criticism from beginning to end. There was criticism of the Politburo and criticism of the government. Incidentally, and this is true, in one of my speeches I said outright: Okay, probably you will not like this. Whether or not you elect me for the congress is another issue, but I would like to say to you that somehow it has turned out that literally every speech contains criticism of the Politburo, the government and central bodies, but none of you in your speeches has spoken about the functioning of the leadership in your rayon or the management in your collective farm, state farm, works, enterprise, school and hospital. Perhaps you havn't reached the stage of criticizing your foreman or team leader. Probably, the fact is that you are a long distance from the Politburo and the government, but when you criticize one of your managers it may led to some unpleasantness. Well, whether seriously or as a joke that is what I was forced to say. So there was quite enough criticism.

[Zorin] Yegor Kuzmich, I should like to continue the party theme. Why is it that within the history of the glorious CPSU that there has been so much criticism leveled at it recently? After all, many people, indeed simply thousands, are leaving the party, including workers, intellectuals and collective farmers. What answer would you give to my question, as a person who has been in the party for almost 50 years, to what needs to be done to prevent this brain drain from the party?

[Ligachev] I think you have raised a very important question. This is worrying all of us, the whole party, I think. I would like to express some of my thoughts on this. I have also been thinking about these things, with a view to learning some lessons. My view is this: apart from the gigantic—and I am not afraid to use this word—historic services of the party in building a new society and defending our homeland, in creating a new way of life, there have also been quite a few things which are unacceptable, to myself, of course, to communists and to our people.

I would like to draw special attention to the following.

Unfortunately quite a few mistakes were allowed to happen, not just in overall policy, by which I mean the deformation of our society, illegality, especially during the era of Stalinism, and the manifestations of stagnation which came somewhat later. There were also, quite simply, abuses, corruption, bribery; abuses by powerful party, economic, and other leaders. I will tell you frankly: When attempts are made to accuse us of such things, too—although, as they say, there is absolutely no basis for this—a man starts thinking: Why is this happening? Is it because there were the Rashidovs, the Shchelokovs, the Churbanovs and others who abused power, who enriched themselves at society's expense, who engaged in corruption, bribery and greed? Naturally, the idea occurs to people: Why shouldn't the current leadership be involved in this sort of thing? That is precisely the point. The new leadership which came at the April plenum, after the April plenum 1985, understands quite clearly that without strengthening the moral principles of society and the party, no perestroyka whatever and no renewal on the basis of socialism can take place in society. So, naturally, what is the way out of this situation? You were right to raise this question.

I think the way out is to be found on the path of renewing our party, on the path of its democratization, on the path of the party masses assuming real power. I cannot see any other way. Therefore, I welcome in every way the utmost expansion of the rights of communists and primary party organizations. We must be decisive about abandoning the practice of ruling the fate of various communists from above. What happens to a communist—be it good or bad—all this must be considered above all by the communists in the primary party organization where he is registered. That is of fundamental importance.

[Zorin] Yegor Kuzmich, one can now see, let me put it this way, several trends or platforms. Let us imagine that the 28th party congress ended yesterday. What will the party of communists founded by Lenin be like as a result of it, as a result of the 28th congress?

[Ligachev] First, I would like to say a few words on what you said at the beginning, as regards the trends. I hold a view which is somewhat different from the one held by those who say that in our party there are radicals, conservatives, right-wingers and left wingers. That does not reveal the very essense of the platforms and the trends existing in the party. From my point of view, the overwhelming majority of communists adhere to the basis of scientific socialism. That is the very core, if you like, of our party. However, there are also parties and trends of another kind. What are they? They are socialist democratic and revisionist. I think that this assessment of the trends existing in the party is closer to the truth, because it immediately defines the tendency.

Now on to the second part of your question as to how I imagine the party after the 28th congress. I think that there will be no split in the party at the congress. Perhaps, certain groups of communists will pull out of the party, although, certainly, this would not be desirable. I believe in the party which I entered voluntarily, and I think that as a result of the 28th congress, the party will be renewed, it will be a party of the masses, which is deeply democratized and organised, although of course, naturally, this will not happen out of the blue. More colossal efforts will be required to implement the decisions to be adopted at the 28th party congress.

[Zorin] Yegor Kuzmich, here is my last question. Naturally the 28th party congress will be discussing this country's economic affairs, the way the country can be taken out of the impasse. Naturally, what will be at issue is how specifically the party structure can be changed, perhaps, so that it can find opportunities to cooperate with other parties. After all there are such parties now. At the Russian Congress of People's Deputies a candidate for the presidency spoke about the fact that the CPSU will only be able to engage in cooperation on the political arena in this country when it repents of its sins. That is what was heard at this congress. After all the Communist Party must seek some sort of new ways of cooperating with its rivals and enemies, who hold totally different views. What is now to be done in this respect? Are there any projects, perhaps, and are any theoretical projects being developed in this respect? What do you say?

[Ligachev] You are quite right in saying that matters linked to the party's work with the new public organizations and with public organizations in general, I would say with public movements, are very important. Incidentally, not long ago, a new department [otdel] was created within the structure of the party Central Committee to that end, which deals specifically with matters of studying the activities of public organizations and public movements. It is extremely important because prior to this it was scattered thoughout many departments whereas it is now done in just the one. This in itself points to the fact that we attribute great significance to it. I think that there will be departments like this in the party committees as well, for we have truly embarked upon the multiparty era now and it is very important at this point to be familiar with these public organizations and therefore very important, too, to establish contacts and develop links with them. I am profoundly convinced of this and quite sincere in saying that without links with these public movements, without taking their interests into account and without compromises of any kind—I should just like to emphasize not compromises in general but on a principled and healthy basis, compromises in the name of the interests of the people as a whole, rather than, as is sometimes the case, in the name of the personal ambitions of this or that group of people—we must of course take this course. It is correct in my view to do so.

[Zorin] And the very last question which I cannot fail to put to you as a Russian. The Russian Congress of People's Deputies is in progress today. Russia is in ferment, so to speak, at least it is in the Kremlin. I've been working there as an accredited journalist for 10 days now. What are your thoughts and reflections on this, Yegor Kuzmich?

[Ligachev] Well, I think the fact that the focus of the First Congress of Russian Deputies has been the question of Russia's economic and political sovereignty is perfectly legitimate. I am strongly committed to that view. Russia deserves a different fate.

[Zorin] A better one?

[Ligachev] A better one. It has earned it. There's no doubt of that; by its massive contributions, in revolution, science and culture, to the development of Russia itself and in providing all kinds of truly internationalist and voluntary aid to the peoples, not just in our own country, but to many peoples of the world both in achieving independence and in developing and establishing that independence. These contributions are immense. They are extraordinary. I should, however, like to say this: I think it unworthy of us, Russians, to forget the historic fate that has been prepared for us. I am talking of the fact that we should be internationalists.

We must definitely be the pivot—such is history—around which the peoples of our country must rally. We, the present generation, are not the only Russians. The Russians go back centuries, millenia in history. Just look, every succeeding generation of Russians has made its contribution to the creation of this united, mighty Russian state. Therefore, we cannot be indifferent toward those centrifugal forces which exist, both in the Russian Federation and in the Union federation.

In other words, I would like to stress that sovereignty of any kind, of this or that republic, should not weaken the efforts being made by the republic, including the Russian Republic, to resolve international problems which are common to the entire state and the entire people.

To this I would like to add the following: I firmly believe that Russia needs to have its own communist party. I consider that this question must be resolved before the congress, even if this also requires the formation of electoral bodies within the republic.

[Zorin] Before the CPSU congress, the all-Union congress?

[Ligachev] Yes, before the congress, before the 28th CPSU Congress.

[Zorin] Who do you see as chairman of the Russian Communist Party? If you will allow me to continue this line of thought, let me say that I am against the abbreviation RCP. I favor Russ.CP [Ross. KP]. This would make it clear that we are talking about the Russian Communist Party.

[Ligachev] That's right.

[Zorin] Not the Romanian Communist Party.

[Ligachev] That's quite right. I absolutely agree. I also favor the Russian Communist Party. This is a more clearcut concept. I think that the delegates should answer the question which you and I have raised.

[Zorin] Good. Thank you.

[Ligachev] Thank you too for listening, and for the conversation.

'More Reasonable Line' From Yeltsin Predicted

PM0106084090 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 30 May 90

[Interview with USSR presidential press secretary Arkadiy Maslennikov by diplomatic editor Nik Gowing in Canada from channel 4 "News" program—no date given; recorded]

[Text] Among Gorbachev's aides here the talking point continues to be Boris Yeltsin's election as head of the Russian Federation. But in an interview with channel 4 "News" the Soviet president's spokesman said Yeltsin's election does not concern Mr. Gorbachev unduly.

[Maslennikov] If Yeltsin would be as good as his words are about necessity of consolidation, maintaining socialist direction of his policy, and unity of a federation, there will be no problem for businesslike operation between him and Yeltsin as chairman of Supreme Soviet of Russian Federation.

[Gowing] Mr. Yeltsin is a great supporter of the Russian Federation; he's talked of independence for the Russian Federation. How fearful, then, is Mr. Gorbachev that Mr. Yeltsin is going to push for an independent sovereign Russia?

[Maslennikov] Our analysis is that, while being elected, he will cite more reasonable line, as every experienced politician. He'll probably...

[Gowing interrupts] You don't believe that Mr. Yeltsin will push for a...

[Maslennikov interrupts] I don't believe...

[Gowing interrupts] ...sovereign independent Russian Federation?

[Maslennikov] I don't believe... from whom he wants to be independent? If you want just to destroy the country you can push for that. He's probably... he would not probably go that way because he will... it will not be acceptable to the majority of population.

[Gowing] Mr. Yeltsin has accused President Gorbachev of being, quote: "my perpetual opponent—the lover of half-measures and half-steps." Now, this doesn't sound like a recipe for coexistence between Mr. Yeltsin and your president.

[Maslennikov] Probably you should take some words of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin with a very big pinch of salt. He is much less than president; he is not somebody who can pursue his own policy. He has been elected to his post by a majority only of three votes, and he takes a line which is not acceptable to a majority of members of people's deputies of Russian Federation or even, say, Supreme Soviet. He may be justly elected, so he have to take into account: That's very slim majority vote.

Yeltsin Seeks 'Productive Dialogue'

LD0106123790 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Vladimir Isachenkov and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Boris Yeltsin, chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet, today voiced hope for mutual understanding with President Mikhail Gorbachev.

In a talk with journalists today during a break in the work of the first Congress of the People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, he said:

"I am prepared to go a good part of the distance towards Gorbachev, throwing aside everything personal that has piled up recently. I hope that he, too, will cover part of the road".

In response to a question about possible friction with Gorbachev after his return from the United States, Yeltsin said that he seeks a productive dialogue, not confrontation.

"We have got to meet with him and discuss important questions. The last time we met was before the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies (a year ago—note by TASS)," Yeltsin said.

Yeltsin Discusses European Trip, Health

90UN1928A Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 15 May 90 pp 1, 3

[Interview with B.N. Yeltsin by L. Piskareva in Sverdlovsk, sent to Riga for SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH by N. Belozerov; date not given: "Boris Yeltsin: Colossal Activity Is Being Conducted Not To 'Let Me In'"]

[Text] [Piskareva] Boris Nikolayevich, our readers want to know about the purpose of your trips to England and Spain and they also want to know how you feel after the operation.

[Yeltsin] The purpose of my trip to England was to meet with Margaret Thatcher, as agreed in advance. My second purpose was to meet various other party leaders. My third purpose was to start a foundation for AIDS prevention in the USSR. My first donation to the foundation was the 250,000 pounds sterling ($450,000) which I received for my book published in the West. While still in London I participated in the presentation of the book and in a short, two-hour press conference. That was all I managed to do in the 20 hours I spent in this capital city.

I had a very interesting 55-minute long conversation with Margaret Thatcher. It touched on many subjects—the perestroyka in the USSR, and the degree of possible influence the international community may have on the improvement of the situation in the USSR. We talked about the programs that Great Britain could take part in, and about the ways we need to determine to make the reform and the perestroyka more radical. We discussed the possibility, after Russia becomes independent, of signing an agreement on cooperation with Great Britain in the fields of the economy, science and research, and culture. We discussed training for our young managers of 30-35 years of age, and the construction of residential houses and hotels in our country and in Russia. We discussed developing economic ties, including mutual enterprises—in this respect things are going rather badly, partially because of bureaucratic obstacles. We both agreed on that. We talked about the future independence of our enterprises, which should allow us access to the international market as well as an opportunity to enter into independent agreements, etc. All this should, of course, revive Russia's economy.

[Piskareva] Is England also interested in that?

[Yeltsin] Definitely. That is what I am trying to say in general: We do have mutual interests, therefore we had a corresponding dialogue. Generally speaking, it was rather daring of Margaret Thatcher to set up such a meeting just before the elections. This is another reminder of her being a politician.

After that there was Spain. I was invited there to speak at the European conference of politicians "Europe Without Boundaries." But our session here went on longer than planned; I had to change the time of all my meetings in England. So I arrived in Spain after the conference was already over. However, all of its participants stayed there to listen to my speech. I spoke for some 40 minutes, to a simultaneous translation. I think the reception was a good, warm one.

We had agreed to have a meeting with Andreotti in Italy on 6 May. But there was some time left before this and I decided to go back to Moscow to spend the first of May there. For that flight I had to change planes in Barcelona.

It is a three-hour domestic flight from Cordoba to Barcelona. After one hour in the air the plane lost its control system. The pilot had to return using hand steering, and then he started looking for a specific runway. He tried to land on it four times and missed it every time. His navigation instruments did not work. He would bank one way and lean on one side then bank the other way and lean on the other side. Then the landing gear would not come out. At the last moment he finally got on the runway and "flopped" there. During that landing I was jolted and jarred so badly that one of my discs tore. Later they discovered it was the disc between the third and fourth vertebrae.

[Piskareva] So it was a trauma? They wrote here that you had a sudden attack of pain....

[Yeltsin] No, that is all lies. It was a very real trauma. I lost the use of my right leg, the pain was so excruciating I could hardly bear it. They put me on a different plane right away and sent me to Barcelona. There, in Barcelona, I managed to "get into the hands" of one of the best neurosurgeons in the world, Dr. Lebergi. It was at night, as late 1130, but they did a complete examination on me. It only took them about an hour. They determined that everything between the vertebrae was really torn and they said that I needed an urgent operation. Otherwise my leg could be paralyzed. They let me think for 15 minutes, though they also told me that they could use some narcotics to kill the pain but it might be too late if I waited until Moscow. I gave my consent to be operated on. Later some Moscow surgeons came to Spain on other business and told me they would not have even done the operation. And if I had found a group of surgeons to operate I would have spent six months in bed.

But Dr. Lebergi promised to get me on my feet the next day. It was totally fantastic! They operated on me for an hour and a half with general anesthesia. In the morning of 1 May I came to after the anesthesia and they moved me into a regular room from the intensive care unit.

I must say that I happened to be in a very interesting cooperative hospital. The cooperative consists of 160,000 local residents and medical staff. They have 400 one-bed rooms, exactly the same, in the hospital. It does not matter who you are—a worker, or the president. If you are in the hospital, the conditions are the same for everyone. Well, in the morning on 1 May the doctor came in and said that I had to get up. I sweated a lot but got up. It was really a miracle. I told him this was because of he was such a doctor. He objected that it was due to my character and health. So we exchanged pleasantries like this.

In three days I could already fly to Moscow.

I was met enthusiastically in Sheremetyevo, from which I barely escaped, and on Monday (7 May—Editor) I was already at work.

[Piskareva] Boris Nikolayevich, may your state of health prevent you from participating in the first congress of Russian people's deputies?

[Yeltsin] I am ready for the competition, the competition for the post of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman. In that respect I am taking into account the wishes of the constituency which I heard at our meetings in Sverdlovsk. My deputy program has been expanded, it has become more fundamental. I strengthened its economics section. In short, I am working quite a lot now.

[Piskareva] The "Democratic Russia" bloc of RSFSR deputies will nominate you for the position of RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman. You have also been nominated a candidate delegate of the 28th CPSU Congress. I wonder, what will you personally bring to the CPSU congress?

[Yeltsin] The basis is still the "Democratic Platform." There are many concepts in the CPSU Central Committee Platform with which I cannot agree. I have to say this at the congress. It is the last opportunity to employ radical reforms in the CPSU.

[Piskareva] Do you think it possible?

[Yeltsin] I do not feel very hopeful. But it would be wrong not to use such an opportunity. Now, after the CPSU Central Committee Open Letter some communists have been giving up their party membership cards. We in the Interregional Group do not condemn it; let people do what they think is best. But we want them to become our allies later. If we fail to achieve something at the congress, then the Democratic Platform will somehow become an independent organization. And I want to repeat that we have to use our last opportunity and to proclaim our stand at the congress.

There is extensive preparation going on now for the RSFSR people's deputies congress. You must have in mind that colossal activity is being conducted not to "let me in." They are selecting alternate nominees and designing ways to fight me at the congress. The speeches of M.S. Gorbachev also serve to show who he will provide support to. It is not going to be me.

Vladimir Posner Discusses Current Issues

PM3105152490

[Editorial Report] London BBC Television Network in English at 2130 GMT 30 May broadcasts in its "Newsnight" program a panel discussion of current Soviet issues and the Washington summit. The participants include Soviet commentator Vladimir Posner. The following exchanges occur between Posner and presenter Peter Snow.

[Snow] Vladimir Posner, if Mr. Yeltsin does what he says he'll do to defy Soviet central power, what sort of a leader is Mr. Gorbachev going to be? What's he going to be leading?

[Posner] Well, first of all, Mr. Yeltsin can't do it: He is not the president of the Russian Federation, notwithstanding all that I've read and seen here: He's the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, which is not the same thing as the president. In fact, in an interview I did with him not long ago—which was not put on Soviet television, interestingly enough—he said that he planned to run for president two years after winning the chairmanship. So he doesn't have all that much executive power. He's playing to Russian sentiment, which is understandable—it's good politics—but I think he's limited in what he can actually do. There's more said here than is realistic.

[Snow] But if—with the support of the majority in the Russian Federation parliament that he has—he is able to do what he says he's going to do...

[Posner interrupts] He's got in...

[Snow] ...to challenge Soviet power, then what happens to the Soviet Union?

[Posner] He has, in the parliament, a very small majority—I mean, I... in fact, I was amazed that it was so close: He won by six votes. He cannot have his way with that parliament—clearly not. The question that you were asking about whether or not Vlasov would actually be endorsed as prime minister: It doesn't depend only on Yeltsin. He's a leader who has enormous support outside the parliament—much more so than inside the parliament—and that's something he'll have to deal with.

[Snow] Well, all right, let's assume the worst: Let's assume that Mr. Yeltsin does manage to defy central Soviet power and indeed does manage to achieve a great deal of autonomy...

[Posner interrupts] Right.

[Snow]... a great deal of the [word indistinct] independence for the Russian Federation. Now what do you do in that situation: Are you a Russian citizen before you're a Soviet citizen?

[Posner] No, no, I'm not, but I do think that, in the past and in the present, that the republics have not been given enough autonomy; and I think Russians are extremely sensitive to the fact that they've had a raw deal. They consider that all the other republics have had a much better life than they have in Russia. That's what he's playing to, and I think that for a strong union you must have strong republics. So I, I tend to agree with him when he says Russia has to be a more independent republic: I have no argument with that.

[Snow] Now, Vladimir Posner: What price German—all-German—membership of NATO? Are... is there a situation in which Russia—the Soviet Union, forgive me—will accept that? A faux pas.

[Posner] I really don't know, to be quite frank with you. I think that there is legitimate concern about a very strong Germany in the center of Europe. The Soviet Union has a long memory—and not only the Soviet Union. I think a lot of politicians are not being very honest when they talk about supporting reunification. Deep down inside, I think they have certain fears. But I think that there can be—not concessions: I don't like that word myself—there can be compromise. I don't think you can reach an agreement anytime without a certain degree of compromise, and I think that Prime Minister Mulroney was right when he said that the West has been somehow very insensitive to the Soviet legitimate fear.

[Snow interrupts] All right, but talk turkey: What do you want, what do you want?

[Posner] What would I want?

[Snow] Yes, what does the Soviet Union want as the price: a ceiling on the West, on the German troop levels? What?

[Posner] I think, there, probably an absence of most troops in Europe—Americans and Soviets.

[Snow] Vladimir Posner, what do you think of Henry Kissinger's... Dr. Kissinger's thought that we are now coming to a stage when, instead of summits between two so-called superpowers, we shall have three or four people present?

[Posner] It makes sense to me, and I also believe that, frankly, NATO was born as a resu... it was a cold war baby, and it developed as a cold war child, and it's become a cold war adult, and I frankly think its time is pretty much up. In Europe—East, West, whatever—there is no longer this system of blocs, of confrontational stances: East Europe never really was a threat to the West and certainly isn't now, and I don't believe the Soviet Union is. I think, frankly, you're going to see NATO disappear. I don't see why you would need it as a block to the East.

Further on Ryzhkov Automobile Accident

PM3105224590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[G. Alimov report: "Accident on Rublev Highway"]

[Text] As reported by Moscow Radio and then AFP, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers N.I. Ryzhkov has been involved in a automobile accident. At 0815 hours 30 May, while en route for work, his car collided with a military bus at the 5 kilometer mark on Rublev Highway. As the Moscow Radio news bulletin "INTERFAX" points out, the bus driver was to blame for the accident.

We telephoned the USSR Council of Ministers Information Department. The call was taken by Yu. Tenkov, leading engineer of the department. He categorically refused to give IZVESTIYA any information at all on this matter. The question arises: Where in that case did the AFP correspondent get his information? He got it all from that same Yu. Tenkov, whom the agency quotes. Strange preferences, are they not? As if a French prime minister rather than ours was involved.

At the USSR KGB press center the accident was confirmed, and it was reported that it was a routine traffic accident and that there was nothing untoward about it. Ryzhkov's driver braked sharply to avoid colliding with a vehicle violating the traffic regulations, which surprised the accompanying cars. Ryzhkov, one of his guards, and a bus passenger received slight bruises. Ryzhkov drove to work as usual Thursday.

Gorbachev Greets 'Teachers for Peace'

LD3105144390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has sent a message of greetings to the partiicpants in the Third International Congress "Teachers for Peace." The message expresses the confidence that the congress's work and the comprehensive discussion there of today's pedagogical aspects and topical problems will make a weighty contribution to the cause of strengthening mutual understanding between teachers from different countries, improving the education of the rising generations in the spirit of friendship between peoples, and uniting the public effort aimed at strengthening peace in our world.

'Attack' on KGB Reception Office Denied

LD0106113690 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—A Soviet newspaper denied that a foreign secret service agent made an armed attack on the KGB reception office in Moscow last month.

In actual fact, Alexey Mor, a Soviet citizen, accompanied by a woman, threatened the staff of the office with a toy pistol on May 3 in a demand for a meeting with the KGB chairman, the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper reported today.

He showed documents identifying him as Alex More, a staff member of the Moscow bureaus of British and West German television.

The behaviour of the "journalist" was easily explained by a psychiatric aid team who recognised in him a character long familiar to them, the chairman of a cooperative from the town of Podolsk near Moscow. [sentence as received]

In view of his state of health, More was not held responsible this time, just as for his earlier administrative and criminal offences.

Alexey More really turned out to be representative of the above-mentioned news organizations. In this connection the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA expresses regret that Western media people ignored the established procedure for hiring Soviet citizens through the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs and somewhat erred in choosing a staff member.

CPSU Platform 'Unanimity' Concept Viewed

90UN1876A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 May 90 First Edition p 2

[Report on interview with Academician S. Vasiltsov, doctor of historical sciences and head of a department of the USSR Academy of Sciences International Workers Movement Institute, by TASS correspondent B. Argunov; date and place not specified: "Criterion of Like-Mindedness"]

[Text] Moscow—The upcoming 28th CPSU Congress is giving rise to higher-than-usual interest in our society. In the complex political situation that has taken shape currently it will have to determine the party's ways out of the crisis. The draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and the new party rules, and also the alternative documents offered by groups of communists, have been at the center of the precongress debate. They contain various approaches to the development of society and the party. Will they lead to a split in the CPSU, to the destruction of its unity? What is more important now—a comparison and extension of the analysis of dissimilar viewpoints, or the establishment of like-mindedness in the party?

Obviously these questions will be actively discussed by the delegates at the 28th congress also. It is they that were the subject of a TASS correspondent's interview with political scientist S. Vasiltsov, doctor of historical sciences and head of a department of the USSR Academy of Sciences International Workers Movement Institute.

[Argunov] Sergey Ivanovich, let us begin in order: What is meant by like-mindedness in the party and how should it be understood?

[Vasiltsov] There never, perhaps, has been strict like-mindedness and strict ideologization in the party, I believe. We may rather speak about an attempt to achieve it by various methods. Either by way of debate in the early phase (in the 1920's and at the start of the 1930's), or by way of forcible measures and the punishments in the Stalin period, or by very diverse methods of pressure and compulsion in later years, in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev times. Yet what is like-mindedness? The conceptual apparatus, so to speak, is very important here. We sometimes understand like-mindedness as some standardization of thinking and as its complete adaptation to a stereotype sent down by some people from above, and as the petty regulation of both thoughts and action. Such "like-mindedness," of course, is extremely harmful and unacceptable. If, however, we are speaking of like-mindedness as an identical vision of an ultimate goal and a more or less identical view of the paths leading to its achievement, this is probably, granted all the possible deviations here, the organizational foundation on which any political organization is based. You will, after all, agree that it is hard to imagine some structure which would declare initially, at the time of its formation even: We are creating a party, but agree in advance that we intend both to act and to think differently.

[Argunov] Yes, this is quite right. But the opening of the 28th CPSU Congress is not that far off. The Kremlin Palace will be filled with 4,500 delegates representing the most diverse political forces. Some people are even predicting a split in the party owing to the absence of past "like-mindedness." How probable is such a forecast?

[Vasiltsov] The debate about platforms and factions is almost an eternal business: We have had them here for more than 70 years, sometimes livening up, sometimes abating. The essence of the problem is understandable: Do we need platforms, do we need factions? But I believe that a certain inertia of thinking is currently affecting all of us. It is weighing down both on those who call themselves democrats and those who are frequently called orthodox conservatives. It seems to me that given a one-party system this formulation of the question was largely justified and understandable: Everything was decided within the framework of one party, into which attempts were made to squeeze all existing viewpoints.

[Argunov] But we are now proclaiming a transition to a multiparty society....

[Vasiltsov] Consequently, this very question should be entirely different. Now everyone who disagrees with the opinion prevailing in the CPSU may quietly leave it and form—together with fellow thinkers—the organization which seems right to him. With us, however, politicians of all stripes, those who have long had nothing in common with the communist idea included, are continuing with bitterness to share the party sphere and "adapt" the CPSU to their ideological standards. They simply will not grasp that under current conditions it is perfectly possible and necessary to resolve the question of their political self-expression in another way—simply by creating their own party and competing democratically with the CPSU. So it is, in my view, that this is a very important feature in our life.

[Argunov] The CPSU Central Committee Open Letter implies precisely what you are talking about.

[Vasiltsov] Yes, it is a question of the suggestion that people who adhere to fundamentally different positions leave the party. It is said that this is undemocratic, that this is coercion. I do not believe so. Something elementary, in not an entirely successful form, perhaps, is being said here: Comrades, if the position of this party is not to your liking, you have today, finally, every opportunity to leave it for another. The more so in that earlier, say, departure or expulsion from the CPSU meant for a person catastrophe, as a rule, and an end to his career. A person became a social odd-man-out. He was frequently slighted. We do not see this now.

[Argunov] Sergey Ivanovich, there is nonetheless the question: What should be the criterion of like-mindedness other than the unifying ultimate goal of the party, about which you have spoken?

[Vasiltsov] In my view, aside from purely political things, people should now be united also by such an altogether "down-to-earth" thing as a common desire to engage in some practical creative undertaking and in labor. It is this of which we are currently tragically short: the production of material and spiritual values and benefits. It is essential that we throw all forces into an increase in the quantity and quality of the property at the country's disposal. But we have now somehow forgotten about this and are merely spouting words. We cannot continue to live like this. In my opinion, it is now the task of party members, regardless even of the platforms for which they are opting, to organize themselves and get down to business and specific creative labor.

[Argunov] And one further question attendant on all that we have been talking about. What is your opinion of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform? What weak spots do you see in it?

[Vasiltsov] I would mention one aspect, about which least has been said, but which is characteristic of both the above-mentioned platforms, as also, incidentally, a recently emerged third one—that of orthodox, so to speak, Marxists. It is this. A most important point—a description of our society, analysis of the state of the party, and a view of the dialectics of the relations of the party and society—is absent from these documents. What are needed here are not general evaluative propositions (as is always the case with us) but very specific computations employing the methods of sociology and political science. For example, why not analyze how, in fact, our people view the party today and what they see in it? This is after all far from being a self-evident point. Why not enlist our scientific establishments, the sociological subdivisions of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, say, which have very knowledgeable specialists conducting, incidentally, research in this field also?

[Argunov] How can the state and, what is most important, the prospects of the CPSU be analyzed without this?

[Vasiltsov] And the cadre problem? We simply do not, after all, know about most important matters: How many members has the party lost and, chiefly, why, who, and in which social groups and regions of the country? And it is on such an analytical foundation, in my view, that the platform should have been erected. Yet such work has not been performed in any of the platforms. And this is a very serious defect and evidence of quite low political schooling. And this puts us on our guard. From my viewpoint, until all political organizations in our country, primarily the CPSU, have accustomed themselves to prefacing their political documents with a scientific analysis of the state of the society around them and of themselves operating in the context of this society, we will continue to make serious miscalculations and mistakes and to dart from side to side, at which we are still very adept.

Moscow News Editor Views Media Issues

90US0950A Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian 1 May 90 p 2

[Report on interview with USSR People's Deputy Ye. Yakovlev, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI editor-in-chief, by MOLODEZH ESTONII correspondent Mark Levin, on 30 March 1990 in Yakovlev's office: "On the Edge of 'an Abyss in the Rye'"]

[Text] "MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is the best newspaper in the USSR and its vicinity." Of course this is a joke. However, it is also understandable that this joke is true to a tremendous degree. It is no accident that MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI sets the standard and is emulated in our country and abroad. In the West it was given the honorary title "Newspaper of the Year," and the editor-in-chief was honored with many prestigious titles. To be sure, in our native parts the attitude of some people toward MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is hardly enthusiastic. Ye.K. Ligachev even called it "an ersatz newspaper" speaking in a prestigious forum, and reactionaries of lower ranks put this publication on the list of "the yellow press." Nonetheless, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is snapped up to the last copy. The weekly is published in 10 languages—in France, Italy, the FRG.... Ye. Yakovlev's appointments as editor-in-chief, and on top of that as USSR people's deputy, are scheduled for many days in advance, and he had to find a slot for this interview on 30 March 1990 between receiving the ambassadors of Ireland, Czechoslovakia, and leaders of the Hearst Concern (United States).... Employees kept coming by the office of the editor-in-chief because yet another issue was being prepared at the same time....

[Levin] In "The Master and Marguerite," Bulgakov maintained that "it is easy and pleasant to speak the truth." Is this why you produce the sharpest newspaper in the country? One recalls that the magazine ZHURNALIST stood out for its sharpness under your leadership....

[Yakovlev] This may be the reason why I did not keep that job for long. However, the courage of an editor should not be exaggerated. Let me explain. Perhaps, if I were not capable of putting my pen to paper, if I were afraid of going to a prison cell from the office of the editor-in-chief, I would not be that bold. A certain amount of independence is what makes one bold. I am very grateful to the party for removing me from ZHURNALIST because this is how I got an opportunity to put pen to paper for 20 years, produce 20 books and 30 movies, and thus become even more independent because I know that at present nobody is going to interfere with my making a living. They cannot interfere. This is why I think that fears and fearlessness are directly proportionate to an individual's independence.

[Levin] However, independence is not a gift of the heavens. Pardon me for this unintended pun, but independence also depends on something. Correct?

[Yakovlev] Perhaps. Financial affluence is just one facet. On top of this, personal dignity and a degree of professionalism are required. A certain degree of personal isolation is unavoidable here: After all, it is impossible to unite with those whom you do not respect or accept.... There is "a plank" below which you cannot sink: Otherwise, you will lose self-respect. This is the operational line: "Everyone does what is dearest to him." For me, my good name is dearer than financial well-being.

[Levin] In our country the journalists were considered "soldiers of the party" for a very long time. Soldiers just obey; they merely carry out orders, and, therefore, somehow evade responsibility....

[Yakovlev] It is exactly this type of soldier that I was for a very long time....

[Levin] Understanding your maneuver in the process or not?

[Yakovlev] No. I may have delayed development, though I think that I developed in the same manner as our entire society. For example by the time of the 20th Congress I had been in the party for three years. At the time, I was 26.... In 1956, I did not accept Khrushchev's report on Stalin. At present I think that I was right in a certain sense because the report uncrowned the character itself rather than the phenomenon and nature of the cult. I lacked an analysis of the causes, the driving forces of what had happened. However, it was hard for me to go along with this being said and written about Stalin himself.... I survived our invasion of Hungary in 1956 without any major pangs of conscience, but the invasion of Czechoslovakia became a personal tragedy for me....

[Levin] Did you mature enough to understand it, so to say?

[Yakovlev] Yes. In general, "maturity" does not come easy in our country. I for one am very much afraid of people who know everything ahead of time. They are saying now that under Stalin they did not like Stalin, and from the very first minutes of Khrushchev's reforms they were sure that they are worthless.... I approach them with interest and respect but also with apprehension, preferring the type of person who develops along with our society.

[Levin] Still, every epoch makes its own assessment of the preceding one, reconsiders its experience, and there is nothing that we can do about it. At present, such a reconsideration comes particularly hard; after all, it turns out that there is nothing to believe in. All that is left is to believe that it is impossible to believe in anything. As you see it, is there anything favorable, constructive about this circumstance?

[Yakovlev] Undoubtedly, there is. However, this is what the point is. Yesterday, I was nominated candidate delegate of the 28th CPSU Congress at a party meeting in the "Novosti" Press Agency. Over there some of the speakers also observed: "At present, we have nothing to believe in" and asked: "Why don't our philosophers and ideologists come up at last with what we are to believe in? What is to be done?" Perhaps I have simplified it a little, but this is the gist of it. I believe that this is an example of slavish thinking: If a toilet bowl is out of order somebody from on high has to order this toilet bowl repaired; if it has come to nothing being around to believe in, somebody from above has to pass faith "on down."

You see, faith has got to develop on the basis of life, of existence, if you will. A man who has lived in a stooped position for many years is used to it. It is less painful for him to stoop than to straighten himself out. As I see it, we are going through such a period now. Let me refer to my own experience. As an editor I am going through a difficult period now. The point is that I have always existed on the edge of the system, on its lowest step, in my capacity as editor and organizer of the circle of my authors. On the one hand, we have interacted with the system, while on the other we have tried continuously to enter wide-open spaces. Now this system, the one-party system, has crashed, come to an end. All old habits and skills (of working, maneuvering, walking along the edge of "an abyss in the rye") are no longer necessary. There are no other skills in turn. This is why it is endlessly difficult for me to put out to sea now. Besides, a newspaper, even one with a good reputation, cannot live off what its editor-in-chief and staffers think up. A newspaper should have a serious political movement as its base, but for now the latter just does not exist in our country. The social situation is beginning to repeat itself a little.... The wheels are spinning! I just returned from Poland, and over there I saw the most curious processes. Poland has climbed down rapidly from "the gaping heights," has "hit rock bottom," primarily in economics, and is now beginning to rise from this "bottom" gradually. We have not descended like this, and this is why we are not rising.... Here is a more primitive example. My garage at my second home is located on a steep grade. If I leave my car halfway up I will not be able to make the hill myself later: I will have to go down to the foothill again, and go uphill again. This resembles the situation with public opinion a little bit. The party in our country trails because it has turned to go, stop, go.

[Levin] What do you mean, Yegor Vladimirovich?

[Yakovlev] At the first stage of perestroyka, it became clear that we cannot go on living that way. All of us were of the same mind in that regard. For example, at the time I had no differences with Yegor Ligachev whom, incidentally, I have known for a long time—since he was an active oblast party committee secretary. However, the next stage came which required an answer to the following question: "How are we to live?" Now that we are answering this question, it is distressing for me to be in the same party with Yegor Ligachev. However, this is just part of the truth. Another part of it is that it is quite as distressing for him to be in the same party with Yegor Yakovlev.

[Levin] However, Ligachev has considerably more power than you do. He may call your publication "an ersatz newspaper" publicly, whereas you cannot call Ligachev "an ersatz communist," for example....

[Yakovlev] I am not going to call him an "ersatz communist" because this is just rude. However, I still responded to him right then, at the 19th party conference.... Someone observed to me at the party meeting yesterday at the "Novosti" Press Agency that when Suslov had me dismissed from the position of ZHURNALIST editor I did not argue with him as I did with Yegor Kuzmich.... I objected: "After all, this is an indication of our progress: At that time, Suslov had me removed, and now I am saying that there is no place for Ligachev in the party." This is how democratization manifests itself.

[Levin] Not only do we place new markers along this path, but we also remove old markers. Such efforts do not bypass even the figure of Lenin. The common formula "Lenin lived, Lenin lives, Lenin will live," which is more like an incantation, is somehow not given much credence now. Does it pain you, a communist?

[Yakovlev] I believe that Lenin is not only his own victim but also a victim of the subsequent period. You would agree that at present it is ridiculous, well, naive to make claims against a person who has not been among the living for almost 70 years. Apparently, the people who now accuse Lenin consider him to have been a superman. Otherwise, they would not rebuke him for what is going on in their country so many years after his death.... The formula you mentioned belongs in this area, too....

[Levin] However, something about this figure must have attracted you personally since you spent 20 years studying it. What was it?

[Yakovlev] At a certain stage, studying the works of Vladimir Ilich afforded me an opportunity to write about the lack of correspondence between our society and what he wrote. However, times change.... After the 27th congress, I decided to visualize how this congress would appear to Lenin. I spent a day writing, and a second day. Nothing came out of it, everything went to the wastebasket.... Suddenly it dawned on me that the period of implication has come to an end, that you cannot get by with allegories any more, and Lenin is no longer necessary "for acceptability." So, perhaps, our attitude toward our time rather than toward Lenin is the point. However, there is another layer. I see at least three stages in comprehending Lenin. The first one consisted of cliches similar to the one you quoted: "Lenin lived, Lenin lives...." As I see it, all they caused was opposition; incidentally, this is the source of all kinds of jokes in response to dogmatism. At the second stage, I go with him through his time and ask myself how I would have acted had I been him. My response almost always is that I would have done exactly the same.

[Levin] Could you please explain this thought.

[Yakovlev] Let us look at the June events of 1917. The situation was clear: The Provisional Government could not stay in power (I am not going to dwell on the reasons now but it can be proven—take my word as a historian for it). The middle strata were being washed away (incidentally, this resembled what is happening in our country at present). Two eventualities remained: either a monarchist coup or the seizure of power by "the left," that is, the Bolsheviks and those in contact with them. So, I am asking myself: Given that I had devoted my entire life to the revolutionary struggle, could I really agree to monarchists taking power?

There is a third stage of the understanding of Lenin—when you can criticize his teachings (in general, teachings that cannot be criticized in principle do not and cannot exist). By 1985, by the beginning of perestroyka, I had not reached that stage, and not because I lacked intelligence or knowledge but primarily because all of us needed to come to a new stage of development of social thinking in order to criticize the teachings in a serious and well- grounded manner; society itself had to cast off its blinders, including ideological. Such a time has come now, and I believe that at present Lenin may only be defended.... by criticizing Lenin, as paradoxical as it sounds.

[Levin] Should he be defended at all?

[Yakovlev] Undoubtedly he should because he is one of the most significant figures in history. It is impermissible for an intelligent person to allow mud to be slung at Lenin (there have been such attempts). Nonetheless, it is absolutely clear to me that a politician of this caliber has no right to take risks on at least one issue: the issue of fundamental restructuring of the state. In 1917 Russia was not ready for socialism from the standpoint of either democracy or economics. It was extraordinarily risky under the circumstances to take power first and only later prepare the country for socialism. This was a fifty-fifty chance because the seizure of power may yield either benefit or harm. In practice, the latter occurred. While thinking about it I approached inwardly a position from which it is seen that a historic, political figure has no right to take such awful risks.

[Levin] I think that quite a few people do not agree with you on this.

[Yakovlev] They do not agree. For example, I just received a letter from a group of communists from Czechoslovakia. They are outraged by someone wrapping a black shroud around the statue of Lenin on a pedestal in downtown Prague.... However, I know that this sculpture was erected in the square over there immediately after our tanks entered Prague. It became the only monument there portraying a man... in a cap with ear-flaps. An enlarged militia detail was continuously posted next to it.... This is what I think now that I have learned about the desire of some Czechs to topple Lenin from the pedestal: Is this Lenin's problem or is it a problem of our policy in Czechoslovakia? It is painful to acknowledge mistakes, but such is the payment for them.

[Levin] More than enough mistakes have accumulated in our country. The situation in the Baltic area is fraught with new ones.... What is your view of it, Yegor Vladimirovich—not only as a journalist and editor-in-chief but also as a USSR people's deputy?

[Yakovlev] I do not know enough about it; incidentally, this is why I am going to spend my leave in the Baltic area now. On the basis of what I know about the situation in the Baltic area, I may draw the following conclusion: The split in the Communist Party of Lithuania, as well as the Communist Party of Estonia, is a loss for the CPSU. However, I look at it from here, from the outside, whereas the Lithuanian communists have a right (and opportunity) to look at it from the inside.... As I see it, the secession of Lithuania is also a loss to perestroyka, and this is not the first time it is happening to us.... You know, had the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast been offered genuine autonomy in the first days of the crisis everything would have come to an end (at least for some time). If a reasonable rather than a "through-clenched-teeth" economic avenue for the development of the Baltic area had been provided from the very beginning we would have avoided many troubles. However, I repeat that this is how I see it from here, and I have no right to a look from the inside. However, I have heard about ethnic self-conceit which is spreading there, and it frightens me. It does not appear convincing when Lithuania cuts off its avenues for a compromise. Let me refer to a fresh example. Our correspondent called Landsbergis' office in order to interview him. Some official responded: "Do you speak English?" The conversation proceeded in English because this official would not speak Russian.... Is this serious? This is why some of the things which occur in the Baltic area (I am primarily referring to Lithuania because I know it better) sometimes remind me of child's games played by adult people. However, do these respectable functionaries need to be told that it is dangerous to play with matches?

[Levin] All the more so because they are playing with fire next to a very large tank....

[Yakovlev] I also have a different feeling. You see, the attitude of the West toward the events in Lithuania was worse than sour (pardon me for journalistic jargon). If at present the nerves can't take it.... Last summer I was in Italy at a seminar of the Christian Democratic Party. This is how I responded to a question on the Baltic area at a press conference: "For me as a Soviet man, the secession of the Baltic area is a very painful and undesirable thing. However, I fear the secession of any republic less than I fear keeping it by means of tanks." At the time, I was fantasizing, and now it is for real. So, I am thinking.... If the nerves cannot take it, and the children's games of adults in Lithuania bring about some kind of interference by Moscow, the West will not have a sour grimace anymore but will support Lithuania immediately and completely by virtue of loyalty to its concepts of human rights and state sovereignty. I am very much afraid that some of the Lithuanian politicians are, perhaps, betting on this.

[Levin] This is probable, all the more so because, given universal shortages, populist attitudes spread, usual criteria are canceled, and morality and politics do not go hand in hand.... We are hungry for freedom.... All of this inflames passions. In his time Dostoyevskiy said: "There is no crime, there are the hungry." To be sure, he called this logic "satanic," but it is still alive today. What is the reason for its survival?

[Yakovlev] I believe that "well-fed" people commit the main crimes, though this term itself is too ambiguous. However, the terminology which has appeared in our country recently is entirely from the right, from the past. They call those who gather in Pushkin Square "extremists." Isn't an oblast committee secretary who sees himself only with a bodyguard and virtually wearing a bullet-proof vest such an "extremist" as well? Those who talk about free markets are called "the enemies of socialism"—as if those who want the State Planning Committee and the State Committee for Material and Technical Supplies to retain all power were not "the enemies of socialism." It is said "they are doing the party wrong!" when a party leader who has been stealing is tossed out of his long-occupied chair. Has he not "wronged" the party by stealing and pilfering? Therefore, to my mind, all the terms (and they are followed by assessments!) are very one-sided in our country at present. They are aimed at rescuing customary, more often than not official, structures. However, at the same time I understand that a hungry person is very dangerous: He is aggressive. Still.... It is the well-fed ones who drive the hungry to the extremes.

[Levin] Do you believe that under the circumstances we can still hope for a better outcome?

[Yakovlev] I would not be playing this game otherwise.

Successor to Pimen To Be Elected 7 June

PM3005112990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 may 90 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS correspondent report: "Before the Regional Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church"]

[text] Moscow, 23 May—The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, which convened a regional synod to elect a patriarch of Moscow and All Russia to the vacant Moscow Patriarchal seat, has set the elections for 7 June. Answering a question from your TASS correspondent, who asked why the synod was to be held so quickly and what the procedure will be for the actual election, Metropolitan Vladimir of Rostov and Novocherkassk, who is administrator of affairs in the Moscow Patriarchate, said: "At present the Russian Orthodox Church, like other churches and religious associations in our country, is performing its mission in conditions that have had no precedent in the postrevolutionary period. We are now on the threshold of the nationwide discussion followed by the adoption of the Law on Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations. Complex but creative processes are taking place within the church."

"At the same time," Metropolitan Vladimir continued, "church life has come up against significant destructive phenomena. This primarily involves the violation of law and order and violence against the Orthodox Church on the part of extreme circles of eastern rite catholics in Galich [Western Ukraine] as well as splinter activity in the so-called "Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church." The radical transformations in all spheres of the life of the state and society in the USSR and the many challenges which the church must meet have encouraged the Holy Synod to decide to fill the Moscow patriarchal seat straight away.

Metropolitan Vladimir noted that "such a practice has existed in other regional orthodox churches. This decision does not contradict the Decree on the Russian Orthodox Church Administration, which says that when electing a new patriarch the regional synod must be convened not later than six months after the patriarchal seat is vacated." The fact that the election of a new patriarch will take place within 40 days after the death of the Most Holy Patriarch Pimen, Metropolitan Vladimir stressed, "will obviously not weaken the depth of the church's prayer for the deceased. The day after his enthronement, the newly elected patriarch will lead the services marking the 40th day of the death of his predecessor. All the members of the regional synod in Troitse-Sergevaya Abbey in Zagorsk, the patriarchal cathedral of the Epiphany in Moscow, and the Danilov monastery will hold the prayers for the repose of his soul."

As Metropolitan Vladimir reported, the election of the new patriarch of Moscow and All Russia will be by secret ballot at the regional synod where all the bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church, representatives of the clergy and the laity in the diocese, and representatives of monasteries and theological schools will be present, making up around 330 people.

Environment Issues Arouse Concern in Polls

LD3105132290 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] The ecological movement in the Soviet Union has taken second place in the trust of the population, ceding first place only to the Church. This is the sensational result of research conducted by Soviet and U.S. sociologists in Moscow and the oblast. Participants were invited to express their attitude to various public and state structures, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, trade unions, and the government.

More than 96 percent of people polled are more worried about nature protection than rising crime, the problem of foodstuffs, the threat of AIDS and interethnic conflicts. The overwhelming majority of poll participants do not agree with environmental pollution for the sake of accelerated economic development in the country.

Nature Conservation Bill Endorsed

LD3005174190 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—The USSR Council of Ministers State Commission on Emergencies today considered and endorsed a bill on environmental protection.

The bill aims to preserve the country's reserves, to improve the state of the environment, and to enforce the law in this sphere.

The bill broadens the range of objects of nature. Along with land, its resources, soil, water, atmosphere, forest and wildlife, it also mentions flora in all its diversity, other components of natural ecological systems and the biosphere, the climate, and the earth's ozone layer.

It gives such definitions as "The zone of extraordinary ecological situation", "The zone of ecological disaster", etc.

The commission instructed the relevant ministries and government agencies to compile an inventory of toxic industrial waste this year and carry out measures in order to improve the current situation.

Economic

Ryzhkov, Abalkin Answer Market Economy Questions

LD0106093990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 May 90

[From the "Vremya newscast]

[Text] A meeting in the Hall of Columns of the House of Unions organized by the EKONOMIKA i ZHIZN weekly was devoted to the governmental program for transition to a regulated market economy. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and Pavlov, USSR Minister of Finance, answered numerous questions from workers, economists, and party and trade union workers. Here is a report by our correspondent.

[correspondent N. Kvashenkina—indentified by caption] In an interview with a correspondent of the EKONOMIKA i ZHIZN weekly, Academician Abalkin put forward the following idea: Transition to a regulated market is the last chance for perestroyka and the country's fate depends, to a considerable extent, on how ready we all are to take this step. But are we ready today to take this step which we all need so much? After all, most people are simply unprepared for it either economically or psychologically. The government program has provoked a host of questions about indexation, prices, unemployment, and compensation. How can such ideas as market and social protection be combined today? [Begin recording: G.I. Yanayev, all-Union Central Council of Trade Unions chairman—identified by caption] As regards the transition to market relations, one of the demands trade unions put to the government was that we should introduce the market only after having received the people's consent following a referendum. I think that such a position of the trade unions is correct. [end recording] [video shows Ryzhkov, Abalkin, Pavlov and other officials on the presidium under the slogan "Market and Social Justice"]

Abalkin To Participate in Market Economy Forum

LD0106082790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] The mechanism for the transfer to a regulated market economy is the topic of a science and practice conference that opens today in Moscow. The discussion will last for two days. Specifically, the problems of demonopolizing the economy and reforming the finance and credit system, and the social aspects of market relations will be discussed.

Taking part in the discussion of these and other problems of the transfer to the market in our country will be Academicians Abalkin, Aganbegyan, Shatalin, and Tikhonov; Bunich and Petrakov, corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and other academics.

Shopping Ban on Non-Muscovites 'Might Backfire'

LD0106114590 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—The imposition of a conroversial ban on out-of-town residents in Moscow's shops was designed to quash panic buying.

The decision, taken by city authorities, might backfire, today's newspapers report, saying that neighbouring regions threaten to stop food deliveries to the city.

"The new shopping rules turned out to be very inefficient," Moscow city councillor Valentin Skvortsov said in an interview with KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

This prompted authorities to introduce certain changes, he said.

However, although Moscow trade officials are working to normalise the situation, several shops interpret the new rules in their own way, MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA writes.

Some shops are too "stringent" in enforcing new regulations, while others seem not to care at all, its says.

The number of shoppers in the Moskovskiy department store, usually frequented by out-of-town residents has dwindled, deputy director Valentina Lonina told reporters.

Meanwhile, the sale of meat at Moscow's farm markets increased three-fold, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA says. At the Butyrka market, sales jumped from 500 kilos of meat a week to 1.5 tonnes, it says.

Prices bite like "beasts freed from a cage", one kilo of meat costs 25 roubles, one liter of vegetable oil—10 roubles, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA says.

Limitations imposed by Moscow threaten to backfire as nearby regions consider retaliation. This has prompted authorities to lift all restrictions on sales on Sundays.

However, the Executive Committee of the Kaluga regional soviet and local trade unions decided to cut the delivery of meat and dairy products to Moscow beginning June 1.

Kaluga authorities also decided to sell products only to those who have a local residential permit.

Vladimir and Kalinin regions have also declared a food blockade on Moscow, newspapers report.

'Timidity' of Market Program Deplored

PM3105092190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 May 90 First Edition p 5

["Our Commentary" by Yegor Gaydar: "Prices and the Market"]

[Text] The government has submitted for discussion the concept for a transition to a regulated market economy. The previous version, examined twice in April at a joint sitting of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation, envisaged the implementation as early as 1990-1991 of firm measures to destatize the economy, ensure free enterprise, and sharply limit the scope of state orders and the unfreezing of prices. Debates on the correctness of this course and the social and economic consequences of the choice are being conducted everywhere.

The documents that have been published enable one to draw the conclusion that the government has abandoned the idea of radicalizing the reform on the basis of the strategy which has been dubbed "shock therapy" in our country and has returned to the positions of the previously adopted program of economic improvement on the fundamental questions of developing the system of economic management. The most significant innovation is the drastic administrative hike in retail prices. It is now proposed to implement that hike simultaneously with an increase in wholesale and purchase prices in 1990-1991.

As the economic difficulties deepen, so the government finds itself in a vicious circle. With each passing day it becomes ever clearer that to continue to try to balance between the market and administration by decree is impossible, that the traditional commands are not working, and that the center is losing control of the situation. But at the same time it bears an increasing burden of responsibility for the unkept promises, the empty shelves, and the ever diminishing meager stock of trust placed in it. No wonder that impulses to radicalize the transformations and a desire to shorten as much as possible the period of transition to the market alternate with appeals for sensible caution.

The vacillation in the present situation is understandable. It is important to understand: Why has it been decided to seek a way out of the impasse by relying on such an extremely unpopular measure as raising prices? The fact that the existing prices are extremely imperfect, do not reflect the relationship between supply and demand, and were out of touch with world prices has long been well known. It is also well known that it is virtually impossible to eliminate these defects by a mere administrative alteration of the figures. The State Committee for Prices is capable of taking account of the changing level of costs only once every few years.

In the transfer to the market the price formation mechanism itself changes fundamentally. Effective demand becomes the most important factor.

It was at just such a market strategy that the previous "radical" version of the government program was aimed. The proposal was to centrally raise only a limited range of clearly understated prices for output and services from monopoly sectors and to introduce free prices in the other spheres. The most vulnerable point of this version was surely the blind faith that when suppressed inflation develops into open inflation and the empty shelves are replaced by rapidly rising prices, it will be easier to halt inflation, and also the poor elaboration of measures making it possible to restrict effective demand in advance.

It could have been remedied by beginning a credit reform and the demonopolization of the economy in 1990, without waiting for free prices. By revising the budget for the second half of the year. By bringing the whole program of centralized capital investments, arms purchases, aid to foreign countries, and administrative expenditure into line with the state's real potential. By selling unfinished or mothballed facilities to enterprises and cooperatives. By beginning the transformation of state enterprises into joint-stock companies and by selling to the population and labor collectives small enterprises which it is not expedient to keep in state ownership. By reviewing the currency plan and abandoning the free distribution of hard currency to enterprises in favor of currency sales at market prices. If that proved inadequate to stabilize the financial situation one could then proportionally reduce all headings of state expenditure, protecting only a limited range of the most important social programs. Prohibit the direct granting of credit by the central bank to the state budget. And temporarily restrict the use of savings for the acquisition of everyday goods and channel them into the emerging markets in securities, real estate, and so forth.

When the government report speaks about the need to pursue a very tough financial policy and says that it is necessary to begin with material and financial balance, it is natural to expect the finance and credit section to contain these and other stabilization measures, familiar from world practice, which make it possible to bring inflation under control.

Unfortunately, it contains none of this at the moment. What it does contain is quite different. Namely, reliance on the new Law on the Taxation of Profit (judging by the course of the discussion in the Supreme Soviet, its introduction will mean an increase of R15 billion in the budget deficit). A new distribution of functions between Union, republic, and local budgets (a most important question but one having no direct bearing on macroeconomic balance). And a few forlorn arguments to the effect that the measures to reduce the budget deficit contained in the recovery program are hard to implement.

Inflation is not a natural disaster, it is always the result of the financial policy that is being pursued. Experience shows that in the fight against inflation everything depends on the government's determination to succeed and its ability to eradicate entrenched inflationary expectations and to show that its intentions are serious, that it will not stop halfway and will not give up in the face of the inevitable difficulties. Without such confidence it would be better not even to attempt this difficult job. In the meantime, judging by the program, the government itself is afraid of the consequences of anti-inflationary measures and is not ready to make active use of financial levers to achieve stabilization.

But in that case it is necessary to abandon the market restructuring of the price system, prepare yet another administrative review of prices, dust off the price lists prepared back in 1988, and legitimize in new prices the archaic, resource-intensive structure of the economy.

When discussing the price reform the inevitable, broad opposition of consumers to the restructuring of retail prices combines with the producers' fervent support for a review of wholesale prices. It must be understood: In the present financial situation they are indissoluble; the state simply does not have resources making it possible to absorb the rise in wholesale prices without affecting retail prices. If a decision to stagger the changes is nevertheless adopted under pressure from the Supreme Soviet, the trade unions, and public opinion, you can confidently give up the existing money as a bad job and devise alternative uses for it.

The most serious social and political problems, of course, will be connected with the drastic doubling or tripling of food prices. After all, even if the state repays all the additional income to consumers this still does not mean that it will be possible to avoid harming anyone's interests.

The general thrust of the redistribution of incomes is not hard to define: from the city to the countryside, from the big cities to the small and medium cities, from the more developed republics to the less developed. Regardless of how fair and justified this redistribution is, its inflationary consequences are not hard to predict. The groups whose real incomes decrease make energetic efforts to remedy the situation. The wage-price spiral is released. It is the inflationary momentum created in this situation, not the extent of the use of administrative price controls, which determines how high a price must be paid for economic stabilization.

If the state intends to simultaneously pay the collective and state farms more for their grain and return every last kopek lost through the bread price rise to the consumers, then the means to pay for the former and the latter must be sought elsewhere. The government program names that source—an uncompensated hike in prices for wine and liquor, tobacco, beer, high-class food, precious stones, luxury goods, jewelry, sophisticated household goods, and so forth to the tune of R64 billion. Unfortunately, the raising of prices itself—as quickly as you like—cannot eliminate the financial disproportions. Even without detailed calculations of the main financial balances or the state budget in the new prices, it is clear that the flow of extra money incomes, spurred on by the hike in wholesale prices, will reproduce the discrepancy between effective demand and the supply of goods. It can be said with confidence that if we limit ourselves to the measures envisaged by the government, then even with the higher prices the shelves will soon be just as empty as before.

During the discussion of the government report in the Supreme Soviet, deputies repeatedly stressed that it lacked the necessary confidence. The doubts of the program's authors about the effectiveness of efforts aimed at stabilizing the economy and about their adequacy for creating the preconditions for the development of market regulation are clearly visible in the sections dealing with the restructuring of the economic management system.

The internal logic and radicalism of the proposed measures are being lost. The program for destatizing the economy, for the accelerated transformation of hundreds of very large state enterprises into joint-stock companies, and for the leasing and selling of the bulk of small and some medium-sized enterprises (above all in the sphere of consumer goods manufacture, trade, and everyday services) is being replaced by rather vague talk of the advantages of diversity in forms of ownership. The crystal-clear concept of the state order, which ensures priority supplies to satisfy defense needs, to meet commitments under interstate agreements, and to replenish state reserves, is being destroyed. Supplies for the needs of the agro-industrial complex and supplies of nonfood consumer goods by enterprises under Union jurisdiction, the volume of light industry goods production in cost terms, and so forth are covered by the state order. Amazing economic inventions such as stock-exchange trading on the basis of approved listed prices arise. And one should not be surprised at this: Even the best specialists cannot work out how to set up a market in conditions of suppressed inflation, which paralyzes mechanisms for economic regulation.

Comparisons with abroad are now in vogue. While the previous version of the government program was quite often compared to the "Balcerowicz Plan," the current one is reminiscent of Poland in the early eighties. The combination of rapidly growing prices and a persisting shortage of goods is one of the most unpleasant forms of development of inflationary processes. And is in no way the best situation for establishing a market.

If the Supreme Soviet does not get rid of what Deputy V. Kurchenko during discussion of the program aptly called the spirit of inordinate wastefulness and the government does not get rid of its paralyzing timidity in pursuing its anti-inflationary policy, we will have the opportunity to witness that for ourselves in practice.

Ministers Interviewed on Prices

LD3005071990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1730 GMT 26 May 90

[From the "Topical Interview" program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Esteemed Comrades! The government's outline proposals for a transition to a regulated market economy are at the center of public attention. We now present a conversation between commentator Yuriy Mironov and Vyacheslav Konstantinovich Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices, and Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems.

[Mironov] [passage omitted] Comrade Ministers, we at Central Television have given you broadcasting time on the first program to explain and defend certain aspects of the conceptual proposals put forward by your cabinet, so to speak, for a transition to a regulated market economy. This has already stirred up serious talk among the population. The increase in retail prices on a number of goods has had a particular impact on people's imagination, of course. We want to give you time to thoroughly set out your points of view on these doubts and to defend this concept against attacks from both the right and the left. In other words, I propose to follow a path which has already been taken by deputies who have spoken at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and to criticize this concept, the provisions made there. [passage omitted: Mironov plays a video recording of an interview, filmed exactly six months ago, with A.N. Komin, first deputy chairman of the State Committee on Prices, in which Komin categorically denies that the prices of building materials would rise in the new year, and adds that there is no need for panic buying. Komin concludes by saying that it would be wrong to hike prices in general until a serious study of price reform has been carried out. Shcherbakov smiles broadly and chuckles as the interview is played back] That's all. Comrades, the thing that still [word indistinct] me about this interview, as we look back on it with our present understanding of the problem, is the condescension of Anatoliy Nikolayevich Komin, the condescension of somebody who knows something very well, toward somebody who does not know it. That is why this interview is repulsive.

So, what has happened? The entire autumn passed with people saying that prices should be frozen. The initiative was put forward by the trade unions and, seemingly voted for this. And now, six months later, these changes are proposed. What has happened?

[Senchagov] Well, in the first place, the economy has not developed the way we wanted it to. Secondly, the promise was kept. Price for building materials have not yet been increased. Work has been carried out on prices reform—a comprehensive price reform. And now the government has asked the people for advice, so that together we can discuss and solve the fundamental problems connected with turning this system of distorting mirrors, so to speak, into a modern system.

[Shcherbakov] I think that we have to reconstruct the situation as it existed then. In the first place, the government did not in fact intend to increase prices, even from 1991. The government's program for financial recovery was under discussion, and this presupposed that such price increases would roughly begin in 1992-93. The situation has indeed deteriorated. The political situation has deteriorated sharply, in terms of tension....

[Mironov, interrupting] And volatility.

[Shcherbakov] Yes, the ethnic, social, and psychological tension. Tension has increased in all areas, in all these questions. I think that we had to expect this, bearing in mind the way we have gone about things—because nothing has changed during this time. Not one single serious action has been taken. When the government proposed its program, it tabled a package of laws. We tabled over 20 laws before the Supreme Soviet on 1 September. I do not want to blame the Supreme Soviet. It has been doing some very hard, serious work. The entire country has seen that. But the volume of questions, the complexity of the questions and the links between them, are such that to date the Supreme Soviet has only adopted five of six of these laws.

Well, we have to doing something about the present situation. We can already see that we are beginning to disintegrate.

[Mironov] Vladimir Ivanovich, as well as that interview with Anatoliy Ivanovich Komin, I also interviewed Tikhonov, Bunich, Travkin, and a number of authoritative economists who expressed the view that the Supreme Soviet and the government were doing the bidding of the trade unions, who had put forward that initiative, the freezing of prices. I attended a joint session of the People's Control Committee and the Committee on Labor and Social Problems, and they adopted.... [changes thought] They supported the trade unions on the freezing of prices.

[Senchagov] We are not trying to avoid responsibility....

[Mironov] All.... [changes thought] These authoritative economists stated categorically that in no circumstances.... [changes thought] And don't forget that this was pure opportunism on their part. Everybody could see that these trade unions, which had always been the most loyal of servants of whichever administration was in power, only not....

[Shcherbakov, interrupting with a laugh] Let us begin this way.

[Mironov] ...and suddenly they put forward this proposal.

[Shcherbakov] I think that we proceed on the basis: first, that we are members of the USSR Government.

[Senchagov] And members of trade unions also, Vladimir Ivanovich.

[Shcherbakov] Secondly, as minister of labor, I have even more reason to view with caution any action by the trade unions. Third, the trade unions are no longer obeying the apparatchiks' line. You remember those strikes in Donetsk, Kemerovo, Vorkuta and so on. You also (?remember) all those calls to freeze, halt, close cooperatives, and so on. [passage indistinct: all talk at the same time]

It is not a question of who was right or who was wrong in September. The situation was quite different. We have to consider things as they are today. One must have an overview of everything. Who will gain from the transition to the market economy, and who will lose?

[Senchagov] Those who work will do better.

[Shcherbakov] What do we want to achieve by going over to market relations? Above all, we want to achieve a change in man's behavior in the sphere of labor, in all respects—the conduct of the worker, the employer, the administrator, in the health of employees, in state administrative benefits—in all spheres.

We tried to do this by the old methods. Well, as we can see,nothing has been achieved. Even now—between 1985 and 1990—many opportunities have been given. Rights were expanded. Certain new methods were brought in. Whether they were better or worse is another question. But the result at the moment is bad. So, the only option we see now for action is to allow market factors to change the behavior of everybody. Everybody must have great freedom of action. But it should only be to his advantage if it is also advantageous to society. If he changes his conduct in the sphere of labor, this person will benefit. Unquestionably, he will benefit. The employer and the worker will benefit if they conduct themselves properly.

[Senchagov] Yes.

[Shcherbakov] Whoever continues to behave in the same way as in the previous situation will lose out. I am convinced. Of course, there are weak social categories of people. In the first place, nothing will happen in the market with a change in their conduct. Second, they are incapable of changing. Well, what can they change if... [indistinct interjections from other participants] children, invalids, pensioners, large families, young families, single mothers. Well, very many categories can be listed. And our task then will be to protect them.

[Mironov] What we hear most about is the figure for price increases, retail price increases.

[Senchagov] What are we talking about? We are talking about the fact that for foodstuffs there will be increases by a factor of 2.1, and for industrial goods the increase will be far less. On average, we think that the price increases will be approximately 43 percent, which will amount to a total sum of R198 billion of which R130 billion is at once given as compensation. I have already said that this is a new approach—that is, we are not merely increasing prices. There was the suggestion that prices should be let go, we should allow total freedom and the market would regulate itself. But in this event the workers would suffer very much, especially the poorly-off. For that reason the option was selected of a step-by-step increase and, second, that there should be compensation. Compensation. Subsequently, we will go over to indexation. Vladimir Ivanovich will tell you about this.

Why are food prices to doubt? This is a serious question. In my opinion, foodstuffs are really the most complex decision. In the past, our entire prices policy was built on the premise that the state needed money. Prices could not be increased. A policy, so to speak, had been determined on this which was not linked to the economic laws of any healthy economy. They said: You cannot; you cannot. But, nevertheless, for luxury items you may. For some cars you can. And it came about that for thirty years, in general, foodstuffs—well, I mean the main foodstuffs, of course. There were increases for idividual varieties of bread, but, on the whole, since 1947. [as heard] For meat—since 1966. When people come here and see, they can't believe it. Bread here... everywhere it costs more than a ruble and, if your tastes are different, it would be more correct to reckon on R2. But here it costs almost nothing, and bread simply vanishes to the value of R6 million. That is the minimum; it might even be R12 million. You know, we cannot go on like that any longer. We are wasting foreign currency; we are giving this foreign currency out to farmers, as it were, as Nikolay Ivanovich correctly said, yet we underpay our own. We maintain relatively lower procurement and retail prices. I have already said, and I repeat it, that according to the old procurement prices the subsidy is ten kopecks for each kilogram. The total subsidy already amounts to R115 billion, and people say to me: Why are you always talking about subsidies? The people don't understand these subsidies. But how can they fail to understand them? In the final analysis these subsidies are deductions from our national wealth, as it were. This is, simply, an appeal to people about bread: Let us think together; let us not put any spokes in the wheel, as they say; let us adopt this decision. This will be the first decision that people can monitor to find out whether the government is deceiving them or not. Many people are saying that the government is thinking of something, that it is concealing something. But everyone will be paid compensation. After the payment of this compensation and the stabilization of the market—in this way we will give up the procurements of surplus grain. Isn't that so? Our agrarian workers ought to earn better money. Let us hope that another set of measures will be in operation and that some recovery will come to the market. But undoubtedly there will be a sobering-up on the part of the consumer after such an absurd attitude toward bread. And there will be some real gain in the national economy, and we will stride on to others blocks of reform. And as for all the other goods—meat and other things, I mean construction materials—all this is still to be submitted to the people for discussion, in the final analysis, and it is our task to convince them. I am not sure that we will obtain a majority of 70 percent, but 55 percent of the population might support it.

[Shcherbakov] We have made a calculation—here it is; I have brought it with me specially—on who will win and who will lose. When the deputies were discussing the government report at the session, Filshin, I think, said that the government wished to line its pockets to the tune of R60 billion and to reduce the people's standard of living to the tune of R60 billion. I think that all this sounds very fine at first, but in fact it is not so. We must understand who will win and who will lose.

Let us take children. Children up to the age of five: losses for foodstuffs and non-foodstuffs, R25; we say, let us give them back R30. Children from six to twelve: losses are in the area of R39; we say, let us give them back R45 as a special allocation. And so on. I could continue. We are compensating children in full, and pensioners a little less than in full. A little less than in full; three rubles are not being made up to pensioners; but we are proceeding from the premise that it will be three rubles on average. That is, it will not be paid to highly-paid pensioners, but we will also be transferring it to poorly-paid pensioners, because their consumption has been different. But in doing so we are taking account of other factors, too. We cannot, after all, regard compensation methods just as one-time measures. It takes place in the context of other events, after all. It will be three rubles on average to pensioners, but we have allowed all pensioners to work and to keep their salary in full. Will they be able to get these three rubles back for themselves? I believe that, for the most part, they will be able to. For the most part they will be able to. Technical college students: We are giving them back R35. Again, we are compensating them a little less than in full. But what we are doing at the same time—you probably already know—is that from 1 October we are raising grants to R60: first of all, from 1 October, we are raising them for all those who are successful students and, from 1 January, for all students at intermediate special institutions and at technical special institutions, and for students at higher educational institutions, to R60. Are we compensating them for those three rubles? Of course we are compensating them. What is the situation with adults? For single adults, shall we say, both men and women, we are indeed not making up between eight and 13 rubles, depending on where the person has lived. We are saying: Let us protect the poorly-paid categories. In what way? We will give as a lower level of compensation R40, that is, 15 percent of the salary, but no lower than R40. In doing this, approximately eight to 13 will indeed not be paid. First, we have given total permission for everyone to hold more than one post. And we think that people should make up for these eight or 13 rubles per month through increased labor productivity. It is our understanding that this is just and correct because, if we are to allocate it equally to all, then some pople still have the opportunity to raise their productivity and to earn, but what is to be done with the pensioners? Then we have to compensate them to a greater degree, but where are we to obtain the money? Then we shall throw a certain quantity of money at this deficit market, which would simply devalue it in addition.

Compensation of the family is a very grave issue. We have looked at a family consisting of two people who work and two children of pre-school age; they lose six rubles per month which are not compensated in the joint family budget. Well, three rubles per adult. Is every adult capable of earning an extra three rubles, shall we say, in a month? We think so. But what about other conditions? We say: Work as much as you can, in any jobs. On the other hand, at the same time, we are allowing a gain to large families. We have taken, shall we say, a family consisting of six children and a single parent family. All of them gain, both from the fact that we give direct subsidies to children and that, in additon to this, we have carried out a whole gamut of actions. The government has not just gone and said: Let us raise prices, and give the money back again. There was profound reflection on this matter. We prepared for this for a long time. And for this reason, among others, we could not carry out such actions in September last year. What have we done over this period? We have raised salaries or, at least, we have already adopted all the decisions on raising salaries in the spheres of health care, education, culture, housing and municipal services, consumer services, and so on. The Labor Committee will complete this work in the near future, and we believe that we will level out the salary base for all.

The second issue: We have adopted special decisions for young families. You see, we have brought the minimum salary to R70 if you have a child of up to eighteen months. We will pay mothers who are not working 50 percent of their salary until their child is eighteen months old. We will pay R70 to women whose husbands are on service for a fixed period in the Army; in addition, she will receive R70 as a mother. So we have also carried out this whole section. So, taking all this into account, it will be these families, of course, who will gain primarily. Well, you cannot say that what they will gain will be great deal, but it can be said firmly that, with the transition to new retail prices, the standard of living of these strata of the population will not fall. It will be preserved.

How will it be with the adult population? Serious questions have begun to arise here. We say 15 percent added to the salary. Of course, in this respect, those who have the highest salaries will gain. Well, let us assume your salary is R1,000. I was in Vorkuta with Comrade Ryzhkov. The underground miners earn R1,200. Fifteen percent. That is one variant for resolving the tasks. And there are people who earn R5,000 and R10,000. To be honest, I argued for a long time when we were preparing this document with Vyacheslav Konstantinovich [Senchagov], with Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, and with Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin. We did not reach a common opinion, and for this reason, I will tell you exactly, we said: Let us discuss the question further. Is there sense in limiting this compensation anywhere? In my understanding, there is. I would put this cut-off point somewhere. It could be discussed—R1,500, R1,700, or R5,000. All that has to be discussed. We have a number of variants for approaches. But I think that we will have to set it.

Let us now imagine: If people begin to behave differently in this situation—the adult, working population—and someone raises his productivity, for all that, will that person be compensated in full? Well, if he hasn't raised his productivity and continues to work in the same way, with the same losses—our average losses of working time have now increased to 30 percent. Where in the world have you seen that? People who are already working—we are not talking about increasing the duration of working time. We now have a mass of issues: to cut the working time; to retire people earlier; to increase leave; to reduce labor norms; and to raise pay. In this way we will not get anywhere—that is quite obvious. So those who do not change their behavior will have a drop in their standard of living. Well, this is allocation according to labor.

[Senchagov] In order to balance the economy—this is the central task now—we must also influence the monetary credit system. Here we have for the first time—I would like to say, and I would like to address all the viewers—we do not believe in the soundness of the monetary system. And from this we have such very uncontrolled demand, because the government says that there will be no monetary reform, but many people believe that it ought to take place. Or, perhaps, some specialists do. And this uncertainty about this is engendering excessive demand. And so what are we doing? We are undertaking an attempt to reconstruct the banking system and to bring its role as a regulator of the credit fund back to an interest-rate basis. This means a higher interest rate for everyone who will deposit and has deposited his money in the savings bank. Then, you understand, I will no longer be running after goods in any situation, getting rid of my money. The value of money—even to the extent of the inflation increase—but price inflation is 2.3 percent. [as heard] Inflation in general is seven percent. So we will compensate price increases through an increase in the interest rate.

[Shcherbakov] I would like to sum up all this work on compensation so that it settles firmly in people's heads, and I would like to put an end to this uncontrolled demand at present, when people are already storming the shops in Moscow—it has been necessary to declare a state of emergency [chrezvychaynoye polozheniye]. First: Compensation will be obligatory. Second: Compensation will take place at the same time as the price increases.

[Senchagov] Perhaps it could be earlier. [words indistinct]

[Shcherbakov] It could be earlier. The point at issue is that the individual will receive the money first, and the market with its higher prices will then follow. It is very important to understand this. Not the reverse. And, third: No one intends to do this tomorrow. The point is that, if this decision is adopted, it ought to be from 1 January. We have seven months ahead yet.

[Mironov] The date 1 July was mentioned in the report by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. It is confusing everyone. This is being transferred to all the price increases.

[Shcherbakov] The 1 July date is only for bread and bakery products.

[Mironov] And this has to be confirmed, obviously, by the deputies of the Supreme Soviet—or does a scheme have to be decided and adopted?

[Shcherbakov] The deputies of the Supreme Soviet have to adopt this. If they adopt it.... Second, everything else is still to be discussed, including the issue of bread, probably. This is also an ambivalent decision. I believe that the most important thing now is simply not to lose today's market.

[Senchagov] And as for the second stage, if one can say that, the second stage, it is really more in question. Everyone should understand here that without a popular referendum—we do not yet have a procedure for this referendum, but nevertheless this procedure will apparently be worked out and material will be submitted, or a report or whatever you like to call it, about the fundamental provisions of the reform of retail prices and measures for the social protection of the population. I have it here in my hands. It has been prepared. But we cannot submit it without the approval of the Supreme Soviet, without a decision of the Supreme Soviet, although there is in general a decision of principle by the Congress of People's Deputies. But probably we are acting correctly. It is better to discuss it now. But I believe that the most terrible thing, after all, is uncertainty.

[Mironov] This 1 July has been transferred [as heard] to all goods and all foods.

[Senchagov] Well, probably, yes. Probably, such a [word indistinct]

[Shcherbakov] As everyone has already understood from our discussions: From 1 July there will be only the part of the problem which is connected with bread....

[Senchagov] ...including pastry.

[Shcherbakov] ...and one should also not delay it for a long period, because then we would be unable to hike the procurement prices for grain and then we can lose this year's harvest.

[Mironov] I am returning to the start of our conversation and this fragment. Perhaps Anatoliy Nikolayevich Komin is right that the prices for building materials will not increase by 50 percent. Perhaps the Supreme Soviet will vote accordingly. At any rate, what is it that I want to draw your attention to? That this is a lengthy process, that this is a process not from 1 July.

[Senchagov] Yuriy (?Nikolayevich), your idea is very good. Indeed, in the final analysis my first deputy chief would have justified it. So to speak, he would have been quite correct. He said that prices for building materials would not be raised. But, I would agree, but I would not want us to be merely a talking shop. We must act. Here you have bread. Here are the real expenditures. Here we sit down together. If something is not clear to someone, let's look at it together, discuss it, and let's take a decision . I am afraid of this talking shop, which is increasingly heating up the situation.

[Mironov] You will still have the opportunity to speak in the Supreme Soviet, to explain your point of view. I believe that we have fulfilled our task as far as possible. In my view we have already lifted the tension which is now present—this can be seen from the Moscow shops. I think that even the fact that there will be no price rises from 1 July for all goods which are listed in the report by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov is already reassuring the population. To date I regard this as the main task of our conversation today.

[Senchagov] And above all we must, at home, tell our own people and all those around us. I told my wife: On no account get invovled in this situation. Do not lay in a stock of things! There is no need for it. Why? Many have already laid in a stock of [washing] powder, and the rash is spreading.

[Shcherbakov] [confused voices as all speak together]. Thank you. Of course, one thing is clear, that today local soviets must take measures which are—from my point of view—of a preventative nature. They must, after all, hold this uncontrolled demand in check, hold it in check, perhaps, including at some stage also be rationing sales. I do not exclude this method. I think that it has already been sufficiently well perfected in our country. Coupons and ration cards are, after all, not absolutely necessary. One and the same person will not queue up 20 times for a kilogram of meat or sugar. One thing is clear, you cannot lay in enough for the whole of life, even for the seven months ahead of us, it will not be possible to lay in enough.

[Senchagov] I can say that in the present situation the government is seeking to speak frankly with the people: Let's choose—how are we to go on living? It is impossible [to manage] without prices.

[Mironov] The people (?will be) against a rise in prices.

[Senchagov] It is impossible [to manage] without prices. I remember I spoke at the PRAVDA festival with a large audience present. Indeed, I said that the problem of bread and of bread prices exists and I mentioned other price problems. A woman teacher came up to me and told me: Raise bread prices immediately, as soon as possible and don't listen [to those opposed to this]. Why? Because children's attitude to bread is disgraceful: They use it as footballs and anything at all. Indeed. You can understand. After all, bread, the price of bread, in the final analysis is a price of primary reference, not only in price formation itself, but also in a person's thinking, in a person's respect for his work, to what he has created. After all, I have already said this, the prices are four to five times lower—it is true: Wages are higher. But, after all, bread is assessed there accordingly. A price is not only what i have to pay for this product. This value itself expresses the value of the product itsef. And if our attitude to bread is so outrageous, how can there be a healthy economy? And i think that in bread—I am addressing the TV viewers—it is of course very unpopular, but I, well, simply, I don't know how to do this and how to express this, but I request support for the government in this step. I am convinced, and Vladimir Ivanovich, we are convinced. We also think that we will check once again all calculations, of course. Deputies are continuously asking us about any figure and we are giving any replies required. And I think that if there is support here, we will stride more confidently, stride more confidently, in future.

[Mironov] I thank you for taking part in the broadcast. All the best! Goodbye, comrades! Our broadcast is at an end.

Official Notes USSR April Economic Record

904A0382A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 20, May 90 p 3

[Interview with I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Machine Building, by L.A. Voznesenskiy, political commentator of Central Television: "In the Zone of Special Attention"]

[Text] [Voznesenskiy] By established tradition we will talk about the operation of the country's economy in the past month. What new trends were revealed in April?

[Silayev] I would like to mention first of all that the trend toward growth in the production of consumer goods, particularly domestic appliances, strengthened. The rate of growth in the production of VCR's, for example. The growth in January-April this year was quite impressive—more than 250 percent. But there should be no raptures here inasmuch as we started almost from zero, and industrial production of this equipment is only now really getting under way.

The increase in the manufacture of sewing machines—117 percent—is proceeding quite assuredly also. There is growth in the production of washing machines—more than 116 percent. The manufacture of vacuum cleaners—109 percent.

Thus it can already be said that the machine builders are picking up the pace. In January-April the machine-building and defense complexes secured an increase of 18 percent on average in the manufacture of commodities, what is more, not in ruble terms but in specific products. But 30-36 percent is needed. In order to attain this pace much work still has to be done. But it may be said that if such dynamics are maintained, next year television receivers and washing machines will even move out of the short-supply category.

[Voznesenskiy] But, for all that, we consumers will most likely have a more respectful and, I would say, more feeling attitude toward such percentages when we can see for ourselves that there are real products behind them which will finally appear on the store shelves. But the shelves stand empty, alas, and this obviously indicates that the process of the recovery of our country's monetary system, the process of balancing money and commodity supply, has yet, unfortunately, to gain the proper momentum.

[Silayev] You are absolutely right. Nonetheless, I would like to emphasize that against the background of past growth rates in the production of consumer goods—from eight to 11 percent annually—we have today even a steady 18 percent.

But, of course, no rate will save us unless we stabilize the money supply and bring it into line with the extent of the production of industrial output. The present situation is as follows. Despite a slight reduction in the rate of increase in wages—from nine percent last year to 7.2 percent in the first quarter of this year—we have yet to succeed in "cooling off the hot money." Nor has there been a rise in productivity. The only thing that can be said is that it has been possible to sharply slow the growth of wages in the design institutes. Last year wages there, I would remind you, grew 40 percent in the first quarter. In the first quarter of this year we have a reduction of five percent from last year's level. This is the result of quite strict measures. But unfortunately, one swallow does not a summer make, as they say.

[Voznesenskiy] Ivan Stepanovich, you have mentioned positive changes which occurred in April in the production of domestic appliances. How do matters stand in other spheres working for the social complex?

[Silayev] In light industry, for example, the manufacture of cloth, knitwear, and footwear remained at the level of January-April last year. There has been a growth in the majority of food products, but very negligible. And in a number of them—vegetable oil, meat, and canned meats—production has fallen three to nine percent.

Construction workers are lagging behind also. Some 13.9 million square meters of housing were built in January-April. Quite an amount, seemingly. But this is only 14 percent of the annual plan, whereas 33 percent is needed. A chronic ailment of our construction—shifting the date of the introduction of facilities to the end of the quarter, half-year, year—is reflected here also. It is necessary here, of course, to strive for the more even introduction of housing and its handover for occupancy.

A most important step in the solution of social problems will be the enactment of the bill on pensions. As you know, following active discussion, the country's Supreme Soviet approved it in its second reading. This is, of course, a very strong social program. It is the government's task to support its realization with the appropriate material resources. And the main source here is an increase in the efficiency of our work.

There is great social and, I would say, moral significance in the ordinance adopted by the government on measures in connection with celebration of the 45th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War. Serious concern is displayed here for all those who forged victory at the front and in the rear.

[Voznesenskiy] The ecological aspect of the program of our society's social development is now of heightened significance. Can it be said that, as in practice, the significance of these problems is increasing in government activity also?

[Silayev] It is. It is well known that last year the USSR Supreme Soviet instructed the government to draw up a comprehensive ecological program. At the end of April the USSR Council of Ministers carefully examined this broad-based program at a special meeting of the Presidium. It provides for a considerable retooling of operating enterprises and a sharp improvement in their environmental parameters. The creation of new technology and new equipment which would make the functioning of the most complex industries absolutely safe for the environment will be necessary also. And you understand, of course, the program envisages an increase in the responsibility of the enterprises and their managers for the environmental results of their activity and a rise in the discipline level.

[Voznesenskiy] And what is the fate of this program?

[Silayev] It has been supported in principle, and instructions have been given that it be elaborated with regard for particular features of the new economic conditions. After follow-up discussion in the government, the program will be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

I have to say that this program is not cheap. In accordance with the experience of Western countries, which began to deal with these problems successfully earlier, the cost of the capital outlays here increases up to 40 percent. And I call here on the leaders of enterprises, sectors, and regions not to economize on ecology. Concern for the state of the environment should be a priority.

[Voznesenskiy] I believe that the successful accomplishment of this program will be secured if its ecological aspects are most closely linked with the economic aspects and in such a way, furthermore, that preserving nature in the process of continued industrial development would be profitable economically. This means primarily, in my opinion, not so much the creation of some prohibitive barriers as the creation of incentive systems which for the enterprises and for any entrepreneur, collective or individual, make it profitable to work so as to preserve the environment to the maximum possible extent. If such unity is ensured, the program will work.

[Silayev] I agree....

[Voznesenskiy] Of course, Ivan Stepanovich, the solution of many problems of social life needs to be sought, as always, in the sphere of the economy and its accelerated and, most important, efficient development. April was characterized by the fact that social thought turned increasingly often and, perhaps, in increasing depth to a controlled market. What work has the government done in this connection?

[Silayev] This is undoubtedly the principal problem being studied by the government. The program of transition to a controlled market is being drawn up with the enlistment of a wide circle of scientists and specialists of a diverse profile. We understand that under the conditions of transition it is essential to provide for measures of social protection for the population, particularly its low-income strata—invalids, pensioners, students, and people on a fixed income. We must protect them against possible difficult problems which will arise upon the transition to a controlled market. The government is approaching a solution of this problem with all due responsibility. And we are looking to obtain the support of the population here.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, without such support, of course, this whole work will be unsuccessful. Nationwide quest, nationwide efforts and nationwide support are needed here.

Science

Reportage on Flight of 'Kristall' Module

Launched From Baykonur

LD3105110190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1035 GMT on 31 May continues its report on the launch of the Kristall module live from Flight Control Center in Baykonur.

The correspondents note that the module is carrying additional supplies into space. Everything is going according to schedule. The first stage of the Proton rocket has separated okay. The rocket is carrying on its flight to go into an orbit of about 300 km.

The correspondents discuss the Mir station and its work. They say that Kristall has a mass of 13.5 tonnes. More than 10 tonnes of that is a useful load. Kristall is almost 12 meters long. Its maximum diameter is 4.5 meters. Kristall is carrying four very important technical installations—useful for the country's industries—and biotechnical installations for obtaining super-pure substances, e.g. new medicines.

The module's arrival on Mir presages stable profits from work which will be carried out. Kristall will be in an orbit of 89.9 minutes. The third stage of separation is now complete. On 3 and 5 June, Kristall will approach Mir. The docking, which is going to be very complex, is envisaged for 6 June.

Correspondents Report on Launch

LD3105144990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1100 GMT on 31 May broadcasts a three-minute report by correspondents Vladimir Bezyayev and Leonid Lazarevich after the Kristall module had been 20 minutes in space. A broad program of experiments for studying the earth's natural resources has been drawn up, Lazarevich says. The module carries optical equipment which makes it possible to film about 10 million sq km in a very short time, Lazarevich adds.

Bezyayev links up with the Mir crew who say that they are very excited about the module. The module carries four technological furnances. Two of them are of a semi-industrial type. The samples to be smelted in them will proceed directly for further examination. The two other furnaces are experimental. All four are different in smelting methods and technological approaches. The essence of the overall task is to choose a single smelting process for implementing it in other space craft to ensure regular industrial production in space.

Bezyayev says that the docking has been scheduled for afternoon, 6 June, and re-docking for 8 June.

TASS Provides Parameters

LD3105200890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1600 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 31 May (TASS)—The specialised "Kristall" module, weighing about 20 tons, were put into earth orbit from Soviet territory today, in accordance with the program for space research. The module was placed in orbit by a "Proton" carrier rocket. This is the third module for use in conjunction with the "Mir" multipurpose research complex.

The "Kristall" module is designed for experimental industrial production of semiconductor materials; the purification of biologically active substances with the aim of obtaining new medical preparations; the cultivation of crystals of various proteins; the hybridization of cells; and also for astrophysical, geophysical, and technical experiments.

Apart from its main docking port, the specialised "Kristall" module is equipped with two peripheral, androgenous docking units, one of which is intended for joint use with the "Buran" orbiting shuttle.

According to telemetric information, the systems on board the module are functioning normally. The paremeters of its orbit are as follows:

Maximum distance from the earth's surface—346 km
Minimum distance from the earth's surface—220 km
Period of orbit—89.9 minutes
nclination—51.6 degrees

The docking of the "Kristall" module with the manned "Mir" complex is scheduled for 6 June.

Flight Continues Smoothly

LD3105184490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 31 May broadcasts a report by special correspondent Leonid Lazarevich on the flight of the 500-tonne rocket carrying the Kristall module into space.

The correspondent notes that the module has now been in orbit for 3 hours and 30 minutes and it will take a week to reach the Mir station. The Kristall module weights 19 tonnes, including 10 tonnes of useful cargo, the correspondent notes, adding that useful cargo means: five furnaces for producing super-pure material needed in electronics; a "biotechnological installation" that will make it possible to obtain preparations and serums that will open up new possibilities in medicine; a new apparatus for studying the earth, which will, perhaps, help in forecasting earthquakes; and an "astrophysical apparatus" that will enable scientists to look into the depths of the universe.

The correspondent goes on to say that the most important thing is that once the module has reached the Mir station it will be possible to make all the Soviet space research on board Mir highly profitable. Kristall is called a "docking-technological" module, the correspondent notes. It has a further two docking ports which will enable the Buran shuttle craft to dock with Mir. Buran will be carrying a "special laboratory" which can be removed and docked with another docking port.

The correspondent concludes his report by noting that everything is proceeding smoothly and that the docking will take place on 6 June.

Military

Yazov Meets With Newspaper Journalists 21 May

PM2905104790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 May 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Meeting With KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Journalists"]

[Text] On 21 May Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and USSR defense minister, visited the newspaper's journalists. He talked about the socioeconomic and political transformations in our society, current defense development and military reform tasks, and the solution of social questions in the Army and Navy and drew attention to problems of improving the quality of combat and political training and strengthening of discipline.

The defense minister shared his thoughts on the activities of the military media in present-day conditions and answered numerous questions put by the journalists.

Foreign Military Attaches Visit Taman Division

PM3105150190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 May 90 First Edition p 3

[Major M. Pogorelyy dispatch: "Visiting Taman"]

[Text] Servicemen from the Taman Guards Motorized Infantry Division are quite used to visitors and foreign delegations. And yet the event that took place here 25 May cannot be described as an ordinary occurrence. On that day, the USSR Ministry of Defense External Relations Directorate organized a demonstration by the division for military attaches and their assistants from 51 countries of the world. Military diplomats were given an opportunity to see for themselves the lives and everyday conditions of the personnel of this famous combined unit, examine its combat equipment and the weapons of one of the motorized infantry regiments, and observe training sessions and company tactical training with live fire. The fact that this was the first time that Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, received the guests and offered explanations, lent unexpectedness and special importance to the event.

Of course, many of the guests were already familiar with Soviet combat equipment: Some people had studied it as the weapons of a probable opponent, others knew it as the equipment of their own national armies, while yet others had only seen it in military parades in Moscow.

Here is what Colonel John Kenyon, military attache at the U.S. Embassy in the USSR told us: "This is my second visit to the Taman Division. Such visits are necessary: We are given an opportunity to talk to soldiers and officers and look at the units' weapons, in a word—

to assess the state of your Army. We usually obtain this information from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. But nothing can replace live contacts with people and direct personal impressions. This is very helpful in making trust grow between our countries and armies."

Brigadier Ben Bulaya [name as transliterated], military attache at the Zambian Embassy in the USSR, expressed a similar idea.

Well, it is obvious that the military diplomats' visit to Taman Division will not fail to leave its mark there. It is possible that it will help in taking another step, albeit a small one, toward the strengthening of trust and goodwill toward our country and its Armed Forces.

OGONEK Leads Attack Against Armed Forces

90UM0582A Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA in Russian No 15, 13 Apr 90 pp 8-9

[Article by Colonel S. Kulichkin: "Desecration of Banners—Perusing the 'Military' Pages of 'OGONEK'"]

[Text] The attacks on the USSR Armed Forces undertaken recently by certain mass media publications have gone beyond constructive, interested criticism and are increasingly acquiring the features of vulgar nihilism, a rejection not only of the existing institutions of the Army and Navy but even the very idea of protecting the homeland.

The leader of this campaign is undoubtedly the magazine OGONEK. The weekly's numerous tendentious articles make it possible to draw this conclusion. And attempts to enter into dialog with the editors and express different views on the pages of the newspaper lead nowhere; they run up against a thick wall of indifference.

The suggestion from Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev to engage in an open polemic, expressed in a letter to the magazine's editor-in-chief, Korotich, was no exception. The marshal's letter, which was published in OGONEK, and the editors' response only confirm their resistance to engaging in dialog.

Judge for yourselves.

"Indeed, except for, frankly, the fairly controversy-free program 'I Serve the Soviet Union,' in Soviet television which is so greatly loved by the people there is not a single word about our valiant legion of fighters"—write the editors. Look at the "sparkling" irony in this sentence: not the Army or the Armed Forces but the "valiant legion"! What irony! This is followed by a crushing attack: "Is it accidental, this indecent (?!—S.K.) behavior on the part of the leaders of our Ministry of Defense as soon as the topic comes around to press organs that criticize their department." Nothing more nor less than indecent behavior on the part of all leaders of the Ministry of Defense at once! The word "indecency" in Dal's dictionary is defined as the opposite of the concepts of "decency," "decent," which, in turn, means: pleasant, moderate, noble... Do the professional journalists and writers who are members of the magazine's editorial board really not know this? Then how **decent** is their own behavior?...

Alternating between irony and carping, looking for false imprecisions in the facts presented by S.F. Akhromeyev, the editors assert their negative position with regard to the Armed Forces. For example, the marshal says that the military threat still exists today. "Really?" OGONEK asks ironically? "Do we really need to coddle such a large and well armed Army?" Do the OGONEK writers want to consider the fact that American democracy, which is their standard, did not think twice about occupying microscopic Grenada, and now in an atmosphere of do-gooder pacifism routed tiny Panama?...

Or has the marshal forgotten about the reduction of the Bundeswehr. Of course not; he has not forgotten. The marshal also recalls that West Germany has not yet removed from the agenda the question of the borders along the Oder and the Neise or about Eastern Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia, and the Sudetenland. Here the OGONEK people have either forgotten or are acting as though they have forgotten. Well, a loss of memory is something we have heard of, but why disorient millions of readers by asking, for example, such provoking questions: "...can you tell us which countries are hatching plans to conquer the Soviet Union? Who is hastening to invade our country with its very disorderly infrastructure, with an extremely embittered population that is ready to begin a partisan war even before the enemy has invaded the territory of the USSR?"

There is no point, of course, in repeating the editors' response, the more so since they do not intend to argue with the marshal. As always, they are confident that they are right and at the same time they do not forget to express doubts about the competence of the person calling for dialog. "You, Comrade Marshal," the magazine teaches, "are not only the military person with the most authority but also an adviser to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. God forbid that there be imprecision—especially at the very top!"

A reader who is familiar with S.F. Akhromeyev's open letter and the response from the OGONEK editors might doubt both positions. Well, let us try to clarify the position of the magazine after analyzing articles from the last two years pertaining to the USSR Armed Forces.

In issue No. 19 for 1988, right in time for the Day of Victory, these verses by B. Okhudzhayeva appeared:

There are too many of all kinds of cannons,
  all kinds of tanks and grenades,
and military orchestras
  resound too zealously,
and gray-haired generals, although they do not
  make the bullets themselves,
to past victories drink
  icy vodka.

No matter what you say, the battle front poet's special attitude toward generals is quite in the spirit of the OGONEK tendency. Of course there is nothing wrong with criticizing our generals if they deserve it. But it is sometimes offensive and embarrassing to see the manifestations of the generals' ambitions, their petty tyranny and arrogance, the inability of the higher ranks to make independent decisions, and sometimes the inclination to "showiness" and excessive exaggeration of their own feats, both past and present. The Army has waged a resolute battle against all these things, and an honest and independent critical view is needed here.

But let us look and see if there is any measure of justice even in the poem that was quoted. For the biting satire was directed at the aura of heroism and glory surrounding the victorious people.

De-heroization, uncrowning, and covering up our past clearly hark back to the mocking lines of D. Altauzen, who at the end of the twenties and beginning of the thirties dared to doubt the accomplishments of Minin and Pozharskiy. Now OGONEK is presenting the same idea—"too many of all kinds of tanks and grenades..." And since there are too many—get rid of them!

In that same issue No. 19, in addition to B. Okudzhava's verses, there is an essay by A. Terekhov, a former enlisted man and a Moscow State University student, "Fear of the Frost." The author describes with relish his military service which for him amounted to one sentence: "Life does not end with a barbed-wire fence or gates marked by red stars..."

It turns out that the Army is something like a jail or even worse. The future "engineer of human souls" has gleaned little from the service. Incidentally, his performance was discussed by his comrade in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. And OGONEK itself, through M. Gallay, hero of the Soviet Union and honored test pilot, seems to have responded fairly convincingly to its correspondent: "...the negative realities of army life seem to me to be largely exaggerated in Terekhov's presentation. Just take the ordeals he went through during his six days in the guard house: The sentries were incredibly cruel sadists, and the cook who responded to every question of a soldier who was detailed to the kitchen by slapping him, and the fact that 100 people had to shave with one razor..."

But the most amazing thing is that OGONEK has no intention of getting rid of this excuse for an author. In issue No. 42 for that same year, 1988, he is the one who rallies the recruits, presenting the Armed Forces as an ensemble of many millions of people singing and dancing. Reserve Sergeant A. Terekhov should have to dance to the bullets of the Afghan rebels...

And OGONEK decided to end the year with a lengthy interview and essay about the American Army. Indeed, everything was already known about the Soviet Army. It was time to discuss this standard since so many of the magazine's authors use the American way of life in general as a standard.

Typical in this respect is the interview with F. Carlucci, at that time U.S. secretary of defense. In what appeared to be innocent questions and answers one could see the high esteem for the American Army and its policies and, of course, our backwardness in military affairs. And the answers of the American secretary of defense sometimes led journalist A. Borovik into an impasse with a disturbing departure from the OGONEK position.

The reporter regrets, for example, that we do not have a voluntary army and Carlucci suddenly responds: "Oh, I think it is very useful for young people to have experience in the military. Moreover, I think we lost something when we abolished the draft..." On the whole Carlucci is in favor of a voluntary army but "...on the other hand, the obligation to serve in the military at a young age has a very favorable effect on a person's thinking and the development of his worldview."

There was also significance in the question of evaluating aid to the Soviet Army in light of its "unsuccessful" actions in Afghanistan. It seems that here again Carlucci's answer was somewhat unexpected for OGONEK: "...we think the Soviet Union has an extremely impressive military machine with an immense potential and well trained and disciplined personnel..."

Let us say outright that A. Borovik's temporary duty in the American Army at Fort Benning in the United States was unusual. The magazine devoted four issues to this event. Judging from everything, Fort Benning completely stunned the OGONEK visitor—otherwise he would not have treated his readers to his spirited Western about the glorious American boys (and even girls) who develop their muscles and shovel in money while preparing themselves for forthcoming battles. This might have embarrassed some people but we already know that the OGONEK editors rarely experience embarrassment.

In the cheerful picture of military life across the ocean, in comparison to which life in a Soviet military unit might seem like that in a prison camp, some disturbing shadows almost slip through. It suddenly becomes clear that the new American recruit is deprived of everything except cigarettes and is allowed no contact with the outside world. "For 13 weeks we even forbid them to read newspapers, listen to the radio, or watch television," the American officer states candidly. And the sergeants here are far from angels: "If you could measure the fury in a soldier's eyes the way you do his temperature, the mercury would spurt out of the thermometer. The sergeant brings the training platoon to the boiling point..."

It would be interesting to know what our reserve Sergeant A. Terekhov would think if he were deprived of newspapers and television for even a day... And what would he say about the sergeant-"boiler"?

For A. Borovik leads his readers to think that everything is fine in the American Army anyway. Such great guys: the wonderful chap Willy, the modern amazon Ann Marie, the outgoing Lieutenant Little!... They were just like your own brothers into whose embrace the Moscow reporter would gladly throw himself so that together they could get rid of the hated missiles, aircraft, and rifles. But for some reason his brothers are in no hurry to meet Borovik half way. Distressing as it is, he is forced to state: "One is immediately struck by the bold poster at the entrance: 'Who is your worst enemy?' Just below is the answer: 'Ivan!' It depicts an American combat ranger who has been stabbed by the bayonet of a Soviet soldier with a red star on his helmet." And this is not just anywhere, but at the entrance to the democratic mess hall where the enlisted men eat with the officers. And here is enlisted man Christopher, from whom A. Borovik expected to hear a condemnation of the Vietnam War, who hesitated and then blurted out: "A soldier should not choose. When a soldier thinks about whether to carry out an order or not, problems begin and this ruins the army. This is my answer: I would have been in Vietnam."

And Lieutenant Colonel Frizzo without blinking an eye destroyed the idyllic portrait of the American democrat by saying:

"...Reagan was very popular among the military. He returned to America a belief in itself. The economy has gotten on its feet, inflation has decreased, and there are fewer unemployed. And we have also begun to believe again that our road goes far into the future and that this road must be protected. And to do this we must maintain the military and pay attention to the Army. The prestige of the military profession has risen to an unprecedented height precisely under Reagan."

This is how unequivocally it is stated. But OGONEK does not like such a position with respect to the Soviet Army. When someone calls for us to strengthen Army he is immediately placed in the camp of the "Stalinists," "conservatives," and, of course, "anti-perestroyka" forces.

But perhaps it is only the modern army—with its hazing, showiness, and large number of generals—that irritates OGONEK so much and the glorious army past would have been reflected more worthily on the pages of the magazine. I think this assumption is too bold. Read the tendentious remarks of A. Mirkina about Marshal G.K. Zhukov, which interpret certain of his judgments quite arbitrarily. Or, for instance, the essay by L. Uvarova about Vasiliy Stalin, which is completely in the OGONEK spirit: Many poignant details as though we are reading an adventure novel. And the quite fantastic story of V. Lakshin about meetings with General Gorbatov. As the author himself reports, he gleaned his material during the time of abundant feasts at which only Gorbatov remained sober. Apparently this circumstance also contributed to Lakshin's bold shift of Malakhov Hill from Sevastopol to Stalingrad. And his ideas about the lack of need for storming Berlin, supposedly expressed by a general, raise great doubts. One can understand the author of these drunken recollections but the minds of the magazine's editors should remain clear!...

Look at the magazine's great interest in daily army life in light of pluralism. An analysis of the letters OGONEK proudly presents in the column called "The Word of the Reader" has shown that of 550 only 10 are about the Army and only two of them show interest instead of blame.

In 1989 23 of the 460 letters were devoted to military subjects but all of them criticized army policies: unregulated relations, appeals for the creation of a "professional" army, the demand to legalize a refusal to serve and to be taken captive, statements against service abroad, against October military parades, against political organs, and, of course, against the generals headed by the defense minister. And not a single positive opinion. This is, as they say, pluralism OGONEK style.

And now we have issue No. 8. V. Kuznetsov stuns the readers with biting questions: "Who can explain why the society of military amateurs must be commanded by a lieutenant general. Why do generals command the Central House of the Soviet Army, the military song and dance ensemble, military trade, the military museum... Well, look and see how much it costs to maintain one general."

Do you sense, dear reader, the "image of the enemy"? This is who has eaten the country out of house and home, here they are, the "valiant legion"!... In a word, it is time to get rid of the generals, and the Army...

Everything is in order on this score in the poetic area also, where the tone is set by Yevgeniy Yevtushenko. His "rebuke" to the disabled "Afghanets" [veterans of Afghanistan] is widely known, as is the disturbed reaction to it from many honest people.

We can also see the growth of B. Okudzhava who began so timidly a year ago. Now he has reminded (in issue No. 35) those displaced do-nothing-generals:
...You are in a foolish position.
Would it not be better to wander around in civies...
A warrior needs war,
Separation, death, and torment,
Combat, and not peaceful exercises...

To bring the discussion of poetry and generals to an end I shall quote some lines from V. Kornilov, who attacked with his satire "The Blockhead Rust," and at the same time the do-nothings in generals' uniforms:
Having missed, having failed to see, asleep at the switch,
They curse him under their breath,
The negligent minister of defense
And the commander of anti-aircraft defense.
From America and from Europe
And from various other shores
Fly to our land, blockheads,

And help us remove the fools.

In 1989 OGONEK did not congratulate the Armed Forces on 23 February at all. They forgot—or perhaps they abolished the holiday. But the magazine does not forget to place its negative stamp on army life.

M. Mamayev provides a good beginning to the story about the visit of the American journalists R. Rowen and D. Nakhtvey [names as published] to a Soviet military unit, but pacifist notes prevail in it and there is even a feeling of dissatisfaction when the educational role of the Army is mentioned. And, really, in the essay "Flight Into Yesterday" it would have been better for him not to make generalizations like: "Everywhere we have not only enlisted men but also officers who are doing as they please as long as it is not that (combat training—S.K.)" And the conclusion that the supersonic missile carrier is just as powerful as an atomic submarine is imprecise...

That same A. Borovik—his interview with V.I. Varennikov, commander in chief of the ground forces, is as convincing as his story "The Hidden War" is subjective, to say the least. Having admitted to its subjectivity and taken cover under this saying, the author, departing from the widespread paratrooper romance, conducts the discussion with the typical OGONEK intonation: Those in the foreground are drug addicts, traitors to the homeland, and similar riff-raff. There are revelations of the type: "The idiots were wise men"; "The idiots were wise men; they themselves preferred not to go to this school..." Or this: "Each month the war increasingly reminded one of the sex act of someone who is impotent. I have always been interested not so much in the apparent side of life as in the more obscure, if you will, the mystical side..."

It would be interesting to know if Borovik saw the "mystical" in the traitor Kovalchuk or the confessions of Pereslena. The USSR Supreme Soviet pardoned these chaps but will they be pardoned by their former comrades in arms, the dead and wounded, and will they be able to forgive themselves?...

A. Borovik makes an ally out of the general-scholar with whom he became friends in Afghanistan. "All victorious wars waged by Russia have led to strengthening of totalitarianism in the country," the general told the reporter, "and all unsuccessful ones have led to democracy..." A strange interpretation of our history, is it not? It turns out that Kulikovo, Borodino, Shipka, and even the Great Patriotic War only impeded the development of democracy in our country.

There is nothing surprising about the appearance in the story of such a character as the deputy division commander, Colonel Annenko. But the fact that this lover of wine and women degrades his subordinates is clear from the outset. But in addition to everything else he is also a sadist-murderer and bribe taker who has connections with the Afghan rebels and he robs the soldiers. And this criminal who, naturally, has "connections" in Moscow, is sent to the General Staff Academy. Since the story is a documentary, the character is apparently real—but such things are not jokes and they must be proven by facts. Do A. Borovik and the magazine editors really understand this?

OGONEK could not pass up the subjects of disarmament, the construction of the army, and conversion. What difference does it making that the leading professional military experts are permanently working on this? OGONEK has its own authority in Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Kireyev. Not giving a plugged nickel about the work of the Ministry of Defense, other defense ministries, scientific research institutes, or military academies, he advances his own theory. Not having factual material at hand and relying on Western sources, Kireyev has calculated the proportion of real military expenditures in the USSR gross national product at 12-14 percent, or R104-121 billion, and perhaps even more. He is not bothered by the official figures that have already been published. And this being the case, there is only one path to restraining the military, which has gotten out of hand: to reject the idea of symmetrical growth of arms and military productions, to reduce the Armed Forces significantly, by more than half, and to create a professional army.

This does not seem strange; the remarks are polemical. Everyone can and should have his own opinion. But when polemics do not follow and one stubbornly insists on only one's position, and especially when it comes to such a key issue of statehood as defense—this is no longer trivial.

Reinforcing the previous tendency, OGONEK in issues No. 39 and 41 produced striking covers (in their cynicism). On the first general, admiral, officer, and other training facilities and also the military attributes are associated with the administrative system which is now being destroyed. So there you have it, the enemy. How this reminds one of the sad destruction of training grounds during the revolutionary years and the criminal maximization of Stalinism.

On the other cover is a wounded military hero at the front, judging from the badges on his uniform. In his hands he has Stalin's book and across his face is the inscription "Stalin be with them"... Enough was said about this provocative cover, incidentally, in the letter from Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev.

That this letter was simply empty chatter for the editors is shown by the fact that OGONEK continued its superficial generalizations about the Army after that. In issue No. 52 our dreamers Boris and Arkadiy Strugatskiy touched upon this. The discussion with them was more than broad and they immediately gave advice on all of life's problems: What would our society be like, who is keeping us—rather, them—from living as they would like to. And here is their prediction about the continuation of perestroyka: "We are now just barely entering on this road. And there is no way for us to get off of it. But anything else might happen at the same time. A military uprising—'Impeachment Soviet style'... Rebellions, uprisings, and strikes are starting to take place..."

Do you remember that Marshal Akhromeyev warned about the provocative nature of such statements? But OGONEK through the mouths of the fantasy writers tells us: "In Novocherkassk at one time they suppressed an uprising in two days. But how long have the events in Fergana been underway already?" Are the two tragedies really comparable? But this is their principle: Put everything in the same heap and blame the Army...

In this connection I cannot but recall lines from a poem written recently by the great Russian poet Yuriy Kuznetsov, "Revelation of a Philistine."

Who has drawn us into the diabolical plan?
Who turned the people into partisans?
At every step, there is danger everywhere...

But perhaps the historical materials have given OGONEK readers food for thought in 1989. Alas, the judgments of N.G. Pavlenko, retired lieutenant general and former editor of VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL, about the history of the Great Patriotic War are far from unquestionable.

It is strange to read all this. Almost all his life N.G. Pavlenko has studied military history and he ran a serious magazine that was one of a kind—and now he does not want to take responsibility for what he calls the pathetic condition of our historical science, while, incidentally, also relieving Academician A. Samsonov and the now so widely noted Professor Yu. Afanasyev of responsibility as well.

Now about other articles. Little that is new is to be found in the article by Yu. Geller, "The Stalinist Narkom," which is about K.Ye. Voroshilov, with the exception of certain poignant details. Much more entertaining are the notes of N.S. Khrushchev in which there is so much that is subjective and sometimes even ridiculous that they can be included in a serious investigation of Stalinism only by stretching things. And the recollections of Stalin's former secretary, B. Bazhenov, "The Kremlin, the 1920's," are complete fantasy. The new Khlestakov, who outdoes Gogol's hero, unfortunately, is taken seriously by many readers. And A. Orlov is not too far away from Bazhenov. Both of them try to wash from their hands the blood of numerous victims by unmasking the Stalinist clique... Incidentally, the appearance of such articles in OGONEK is predictable: It does not matter if it is crude and abusive—as long as it is sensational...

I would not like to reproach the editors of the popular weekly in the new year but even in the first issue of the magazine we are hearing a different song... Here one finds the article by L. Salnikova, "We are beating swords...," where both the Ministry of Defense and "military leaders" catch it. Here one also finds an organized response to Marshal Akhromeyev on behalf of the military servicemen who fully support the OGONEK position. It is surprising, incidentally, that they also include retired personnel and representatives of the non-combat officers... It is also worth mentioning the article by Academician Arbatov, one of the creators of the Brezhnev policy who is still making categorical recommendations—now for a significant reduction of the Armed Forces and defense allocations, doing everything he can to show the peaceful intentions of the NATO strategists.

But quite recently it became known that the official NATO representative denied the report that "The North Atlantic Treaty Organization intends to reduce its nuclear forces in Europe by 50 percent because of the development of events in East Europe" (see IZVESTIYA, 27 March 1990).

In issue No. 8 a large article by I. Andreyev, "Ordinary Rash-ism" ("Notes in the margins of a militaristic essay") even with its smoothly complimentary title tells of questionable journalism. In his argument with K. Rash—if one can even call this insulting article an argument—the author repeatedly resorts to juggling facts and outright lies. Taking individual phrases out of the context of K. Rash's article, "The Army and Culture," the OGONEK author distorts the publicist's position, for instance, with regard to Stalin. All this is done relying on the readers' trust, for the number of readers of VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL, where Karem Rash's article is published, is immeasurably smaller than the number of subscribers to OGONEK... Otherwise I. Andreyev would hardly dare to make such blatant falsifications.

And what is "militaristic" essay anyway? Does it turn out that every statement in defense of the Army, every attempt to constructively help it in perestroyka, to reveal the best features of the Soviet fighting man—is all this militarism?...

And the OGONEK roundtable on army problems, whose materials were published in issue No. 9, is not convincing either. The middle level officers who gathered at the roundtable held the same positions that impressed the magazine. Briefly, it can be reduced to attacks on the leadership of the Armed Forces, complete rejection of the army reforms developed by the Ministry of Defense, and extolling of their own suggestions, which are certainly not beyond question. Moreover, it would seem that a roundtable should envision a dialog, a comparison of various viewpoints which, alas, did not occur. And at the same time one could see a marked desire to prove to the readers that in the Army there is serious opposition to the high command from the middle level officer personnel. Thus OGONEK does not find it sufficient to place the Army and the people on opposite sides of the fence. It is important to split the Army from within as well, to pound a wedge in between the rank-and-file and the officer personnel and between the officers and the generals.

It might seem to some people that I have been spreading it on a little thick in this article. No, I have simply made an attempt to soberly figure out what position the magazine OGONEK holds and whether or not it corresponds to the statement of the editorial staff: "We should like very much for the authority of our Army to be pure and high."

The author is donating his honorarium to the Moscow City Administration of the USSR ZhSB, account No. 609421, MFO I-7, Fund for aid to refugees under the "United Council of Russia" Association.

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Discusses Meeting With Yeltsin

LD0106094690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Interview with Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, by correspondent Jurate Valanciute at the airport in Vilnius on his return from Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Landsbergis] Czechoslovakia is one of those countries which not only understands and supports us, but also is determined to support us politically. There have been many questions about the possibility of economic cooperation, aid under blockade conditions, and so on. I think that this trip was very successful.

[Valanciute] You stopped over in Moscow. You had some useful official encounters there too?

[Landsbergis] Today I had an important and significant meeting with Boris Yeltsin. I think that this is the beginning of future contacts with the Russian Federation which wants direct contacts, cooperation, and agreements with the republic of Lithuania. We exchanged opinions on this problem and it is clear how we are going to work in the future. [passage omitted]

Landsbergis Interviewed on Arrival in Moscow

LD3105205390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] The two-day visit to Czechoslovakia by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of Lithuania's Supreme Council, at the invitation of Havel, that country's president, ended today. Landsbergis also arrived in Moscow today. He was met at the airport by our correspondent:

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] What has your trip to Prague shown?

[Landsbergis] My trip to Prague has shown the cordial attitude of the leadership and people of Czechoslovakia, in equal measure, I would say. Our independence does not need recognition. What we need is diplomatic relations between our government and other governments. That is a question of time and the processes which are going on.

[Correspondent] Do you plan any sort of meetings or other contacts with Soviet leaders during your stay in Moscow today or maybe tomorrow?

[Landsbergis] That will become clear.

[Correspondent] In your personal life, do you think that it has been more sensible, on your part, to go for compromises or to seek the upper hand and insist on having your own way?

[Landsbergis] I have always sought compromises. [end recording]

Report on Landsbergis' Visit to Prague

LD3106224790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, was received at the Prague Castle on 30 May by V. Havel, president of Czechoslovakia. Vytautas Landsbergis is in Prague for a brief visit on the invitation of the president.

During long and frank talks V. Landsbergis informed V. Havel about the situation in Lithuania, about the possibilities for Lithuania's future development, and about cooperation with Latvia and Estonia.

V. Havel again declared his support for Lithuania's demand for national and state independence. At the same time he mentioned M. Gorbachev's merits in changing the political situation in Central and Eastern Europe where Lithuania undoubtedly also belongs.

Information was exchanged on the possibilities of concrete cooperation between Czechoslovakia and Lithuania in the spheres of culture, economy, and politics. The possibilities of Lithuania's participation in the Helsinki process were also discussed by both parties.

V. Landsbergis and V. Havel sent a telegram to Vytautas Milvydas who has been on a hunger strike in Vilnius since 6 April in support of Lithuania's independence and to protest the economic blockade of Lithuania. They expressed their admiration for the resolution and endurance of this Lithuanian man and asked him to discontinue the hunger strike.

A visit to the Student's Union Center was the first item of the program of the second day of V. Landsbergis' visit to Prague. Vytautas Landsbergis pointed out at the meeting with students that if anything similar to the Soviet military intervention in Hungary in 1956 or in Czechoslovakia in 1968 were to happen in Lithuania then the period in which the Lithuanian people would again win back their independence would be much shorter than the 30 or 20 years it took in Hungary or Czechoslovakia. In the current situation this would undoubtedly add to the deterioration of the Soviet Union after which independent republics would appear which [words indistinct]

Jan Vidim, president of the Student's Union, said at the meeting that the Czechoslovak students admire the strength and determination of the Lithuanian nation in their struggle to restore independence. He pointed out that the Parliament of Students of Czechoslovakia had already recognized independent Lithuania and that they were the first to do this. He expressed hope that in the nearest future the parliaments of all states of the world will follow their example.

On behalf of all of the Lithuanian nation, V. Landsbergis thanked the students for their support. The chairman of the Lithuanian parliament told the students about the difficult situation for Lithuanian young men who were forced to do their military service in foreign armed forces. He informed them that many of them have deserted the Soviet Armed Forces and others have refused to do their military service in the Soviet Armed Forces and that as a result some have been arrested and sent to the military units. Vytautas Landsbergis stressed that it is these young men who need their support.

Today Vytautas Landsbergis was received by Zdenek Jicinsky, deputy chairman of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly. Questions concerning Lithuania's aspiration of winning back its independence were discussed at the meeting. Jicinsky pointed out that this aspiration was closely followed and understood in Czechoslovakia, that the Federal Republic of Czechoslovakia is concerned that this problem is solved peacefully and democratically, and that this is important not only for the nations living in the Soviet Union: It is also important to our nations which are attempting to set up a democratic system and are pursuing an independent foreign policy which also corresponds to the interests of a successful development of peaceful integration processes in Europe.

Before his departure for Moscow V. Landsbergis took part in a press conference and gave a brief interview to the CTK correspondent.

On his way back from Prague V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council arrived in Moscow today.

Prunskiene on Prospects for Negotiations

LD3105225290 Vilnius International Service in English 2200 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] [First Announcer] As announced yesterday the Lithuanian Government has declared its readiness to suspend some of the laws passed after 11th March for the entire period of its talks with the Kremlin when such begin. The suspension of these laws can serve as an object of Lithuanian-Soviet negotiations. While viewing the Washington summit with high expectations, the Lithuanian Government is making intense preparations for its talks with Moscow. This was confirmed by Lithuanian Prime Minister Mrs. Prunskiene in an interview to Radio Vilnius yesterday.

Asked whether the Lithuanian Government was ready to cope with a longterm economic blockade, Mrs. Prunskiene said:

[Prunskiene in Lithuanian with superimposed English translation read by second announcer] We nevertheless believe that a long-term blockade is simply impossible. The economic sanctions are only temporary. Russia is our main economic partner. May we remind you that 50 percent of our imports come from there. Russia is currently in the process of forming a new cabinet and I am sure that the new government will want to maintain ties of cooperation with Lithuania. Obviously we will find a way of how to come to an agreement. I find it hard to realize how the Kremlin—I have in mind here the Soviet leadership—will manage to block not only Lithuania but Russia's economy too, inasmuch as it is linked with us and inasmuch as Russia is interested to cooperate with Lithuania.

[First announcer] Regardless of how matters are settled in the East and West everything depends on us. This phrase is often repeated by the head of the Lithuanian cabinet. We asked Mrs. Prunskiene whether in her opinion Lithuania had utilized all the possibilities open to it?

[Prunskiene in Lithuanian with superimposed English translation read by second announcer] I think that neither President Gorbachev nor we have made use of all the chances that there exist. I think that we should now make the move from our drive for independence to the stage of very serious diplomatic political activities. We must learn to view our opponent or partners not as an adversary but as an equal partner in a political dialogue and act likewise. We must nevertheless adjust to external forces and have in mind both the Soviet Union's claims and its leadership's desire not to lose face in the eyes of the world, that is that it was forced to retreat from such a small country as Lithuania. Having this in mind I think we should be more flexible, and in some cases more modest. We must learn to rely on our achievements more. I am sure that by showing more trust to the other side we'll reap better results.

[First announcer] Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene on the prospects of negotiations with Moscow.

Lithuanian Compromise Move Discussed

LD3105191590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Paulyus, reporter] At the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session today, as in previous days, great attention was devoted to issues of agricultural reform. [passage omitted: shots of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet debating agricultural reform and interview with K. Atanavicius, chairman of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Economic Commission and Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputy, on introduction of new farming methods in Lithuania]

At the session issues of state control, the property of political parties and organizations, and the countermanding of priveleges, among other things, were discussed today. The deputies and Lithuania's public greeted very attentively a new decision of the republican

government, which, according to the document published this morning, has been adopted in order to consolidate the independence of the Lithuanian Republic through negotiations with the USSR leadership. [video shows Supreme Soviet in session and shot of front page of EKHO LITVY, a Russian-language newspaper]

[J. Paleckis, Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputy and Lithuanian Communist Party secretary, identified by screen caption] What is said in this decision? The main thing is to temporarily suspend the decisions and actions of the Government of the Lithuanian Republic deriving from documents of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet from 11 March 1990. I think that this is a compromise move which would take into account the interests of both sides.

[Paulyus] Do you see the possibility of a dialogue in the near future?

[Paleckis] Purely personally, I do not doubt that in the course of about one month, one-and-half at the most, this dialogue can, and I think should, be realized.

Vilnius Radio Carries 31 May Supreme Council

State Control Law Debated

LD3105090890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 31 May begins to carry a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

Deputies Motieka and Abisalas are chairing the session. The following agenda is proposed: the draft state control law, the property of political parties and public organizations, the abolition of privileges and exceptional rights, and the protection of cultural monuments.

At 0708 GMT various proposals on minor amendments to the agenda are made. It was proposed to discuss the proclamation of Lithuania as a calamity zone. Various opinions on this issue are expressed but the deputies want the government to provide more information on the blockade which the deputies can pass on to the electors.

At 0719 GMT Deputy Lapinskas describes the draft state control law. In his opinion, it should be named the law of the state control department. After this law is adopted, the department of state control can start functioning and a proper state control law can be drawn up later. He dwells in detail on minor amendments to individual articles in the draft law.

At 0741 GMT debates begin on the people's control system. According to some deputies, the present system is ineffective and now there is virtually no state control in the republic. The question is raised whether a law on the state control department or only regulations on the work of this institution should be adopted.

At 0821 GMT by a majority of votes the deputies decide that a law on the state control department is essential.

At 0829 GMT an interval is announced until 0900 GMT.

Power Supply Viewed

LD3105112590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania at 0900 GMT on 31 May continues to carry a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 0900 GMT Deputy Antanavicius describes his visit to Bonn where he met representatives of Scandinavian countries and held consultations on the establishment of Lithuanian missions or representations in those countries. Some Danish towns have expressed their wish to establish close relations with Lithuanian towns, he says. Lithuania also enjoys substantial support in the European parliament.

At 0912 GMT Deputy Zingeris talks about his visit to Brussels where he met various French and Belgian officials. He also visited Strasbourg where a resolution about Lithuania was not passed. It will be submitted once again in June.

At 0920 GMT indistinct questions are put to Antanavicius and Zingeris.

At 0923 GMT the minister of power engineering, Asmantas, reports on the power supply situation in Lithuania. The running of the Ignalina power station depends on highranking officials in Moscow. The situation there has not changed. At the Elektrenai power station two sets are in operation. The load there is increased in the mornings. Industrial enterprises are limiting their use of power themselves. The supply of hot water is under the control of local governments. A part of Lithuania's electric power is supplied by Estonia and Latvia, he notes.

At 0933 GMT Minister Asmantas replies to deputies' questions on power generating. There have been many proposals by foreign firms to supply oil, but they demand credit guarantees, he says. There has been an attempt to bring some gasoline from Poland, but the drivers of vehicles carrying gas were refused entry visas. Gasoline is not being sold at commercial prices. Gas from Poland would cost R1, 60 kopecs per liter. The Elektrenai power station has sufficient fuel for eleven days, Asmantas discloses.

At 0950 GMT the problem of producing generators run on wood for motor vehicles is raised. According to the minister, this problem is being dealt with, but because of a shortage of metal the production of generators is very complex. The 30 May earthquake did not create any danger to the Ignalina nuclear power station, he notes.

At 0956 GMT the deputies start examining each article in the draft law on the state control department. A vote on each article is taken.

State Control Law Adopted

LD3105150690

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1200 GMT on 31 May continues to carry a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 1200 GMT voting on individual articles in the draft law on the state control department continues.

At 1248 GMT voting takes place on the whole draft law. It is adopted by a majority of votes.

At 1250 GMT debates on the date when this law should come into force take place. It is decided by a majority of votes that the law should come into force on 1 June 1990.

At 1300 GMT Deputy Cepaitis makes a report on the abolition of privileges and exceptional rights. He states that this problem is very important as it concerns social justice. He describes privileges to the ruling class under the Soviet system. The only justified privileges under this system were those of war veterans, he says. At present families with many children and disabled people have privileges and grants. He reads a draft resolution on this issue.

At 1315 GMT debates on this problem start. Deputy Rupeika, speaking in the debate, criticizes deputies for their frequent trips abroad and spending the republic's convertible currency. Other deputies mention various unnecessary privileges, like the use of cars, the number of bodyguards protecting members of the government, and others. A heated debate concerned trips by deputies abroad ensues. The counter argument is that this was the first opportunity to represent independent Lithuania abroad and explain its cause.

At 1345 GMT a proposal is made that before taking any decision, the Supreme Council should have from the ministries and departments a list of privileges which should be abolished.

At 1428 GMT Deputy Cepaitis expresses the opinion that such a list should be prepared. This proposal is adopted.

At 1432 GMT a decision is adopted to provide proper premises for the Ministry of Power Engineering.

At 1435 GMT debates take place on the agenda for the plenary meeting on 5 June. There are many proposals and the deputy in the chair states that all problems cannot be solved in one day. No final agenda is announced.

At 1440 GMT the live relay is discontinued. It is confirmed that the next plenary meeting is to take place on 5 June.

'Critical' Power Supply Situation in Lithuania

LD0106104390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius, 1 June—"Lithuania's power engineering situation is critical" stated Leonas Asmantas, minister of power engineering for the Lithuanian republic, addressing the deputies of the Supreme Council yesterday.

He briefed the republican legislative assembly, saying that "fuel has practically been exhausted at the Lithuanian GRES [state electric power station] in the town of Elektrenai, and some of its units are operating at a minimum level. At any moment an emergency cutoff of power supply to the Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES] may occur".

Leonas Asmantas said that only one generator was still operating at that atomic power station, and accused the USSR leadership of allegedly "not allowing an increase in the capacity of the AES for political reasons".

Despite such an extremely tense situation in the republican economy, the deputies once again did not even mention possible concessions, the abrogation or suspension of the "act on restoring the independence of the Lithuanian state" adopted on 11 March this year. Their attention was devoted entirely to a search for means and measures which could assist them in overcoming the economic difficulties resulting from the discontinuation of supplies of oil from the Soviet Union and the restrictions on supplies of other raw materials.

Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic, did not attend today's session because he was in Prague at the invitation of Vaclav Havel, CSFR president.

Commission Examines Fuel, Power Situations

LD3105172590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 31 May 90

[Report by Vitas Usas]

[Text] Power supply problems continue to provoke a great deal of concern, therefore a meeting of the Antiblockade Commission held on the 43d day of the blockade started by examining these problems.

During the morning peak hours power is supplied by the northwestern power supply system. Two units are operating at the state republican power station. An optimistic report has been received from the Ignalina nuclear power station that it is hoped to start the second generator this evening. It could be working at full capacity tomorrow.

But industrial enterprises should limit their consumption of electricity and should organize themselves to work at night as well.

I will remind you on this occasion that the head of the civil defense headquarters, General Steponas Nekrasas, has announced that in extreme conditions small generators at the disposal of the civil defense system can supply power for several days to vitally important objects.

The supply of liquified gas to Lithuania is almost normal. Natural gas is being supplied during the blockade regime. Information has been received from Moscow that this year gas is to be sold at world prices, that is, almost three times higher than now. So, let us learn to save, and today we have all the necessary conditions for this purpose.

Many people are interested in obtaining fuel. I heard rather good news at the meeting of the [blockade] commission. It has been agreed with a region in the Soviet Union that it will supply 4,000 tonnes of gasoline in exchange for meat and milk products. It is intended to obtain fuel oil in the same way. There is a shortage of diesel fuel and lubricants.

I will remind those who are planning to take their vacation that the "Raketa" vessels no longer ply between Kaunas and Nida because of a fuel shortage.

Minister of Trade Sinevicius reported that yesterday goods worth 1.5 million rubles were received from the Soviet Union. Lithuania has already received 180 tonnes of vegetable oil. It has not been supplied for the whole month. This product will be sold at commercial prices.

Lithuanian Communique on Economic Situation

LD3105230290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Communique of the Lithuanian government on the economic situation in the republic:

On the 43d day of the economic blocade of Lithuania, the situation in power engineering in Lithuania remains complicated. One generator of the second power block is in operation at the Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES]; the Lithuania GRES is operating on minimal capacity as a result of which in the morning when industrial enterprises start work the demand for power exceeds the supply capacities of the Lithuanian power engineering system.

The governmental commission for the control of the economic situation advise enterprises, offices, and organizations to reorganize their work in such a way as to avoid the demand for power supplies in the morning hours so as not exceed the possibilities of the supply system.

Having analyzed the situation the Ministry of Economy and Power Engineering was entrusted with the task by the Commission to prepare proposals on the reorganization of the Lithuanian power engineering so that it would become dependent on the USSR northwest system as little as possible and could work independently.

The Republican Civil Defense, together with other services, has been entrusted with the task to get ready for a case of emergency in the event the power supply was discontinued. All the available small power generators should be ready to give supplies at any time to the vital needs of Lithuania.

Having reviewed the economic activity in the republic during the period of this month the commission pointed out that the work of the economy of the republic of Lithuania was very united, that local governments at rayons and cities took steps that life in their areas would be optimally regular; direct links are actively developed.

'Soviet Lithuania' Radio Station Formed

LD0106144990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] We received a report today from Vilnius on the coming into service of a new radio station. It is called "Soviet Lithuaia" [Sovetskaya Litva]. It will come on air for the first time tomorrow at 1100 local time. That's 1200 Moscow time. Transmission will begin with a direct relay from the session of the second stage of the congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania/CPSU. The "Soviet Lithuania" radio station will broadcast in Lithuanian, Russian, and Polish.

Vilniuskiy Rayon Soviet Calls for Referendum

90UN1967A Moscow TRUD in Russian 27 May 90 p 2

[TASS report: "The Will of the Majority Is Expressed"]

[Text] The participants of a session of the Vilniuskiy Rayon Soviet have declared that the question of the Lithuanian SSR's [Soviet Socialist Republic] secession from the Soviet Union can only be decided by means of a referendum. Vilniuskiy Rayon is one of Lithuania's agricultural rayons adjoining the republic's capital which are traditionally called Vilnius Kray. The deputies also emphasized that separate referendums should also be conducted in those rayons of the republic that joined the republic on the basis of political decisions made by the leadership of the USSR in 1939- 1940.

The people's representatives affirmed the resolution of the Vilniuskiy Rayon Soviet of 15 September 1989 "On the Declaration on the Territory of Vilniuskiy Rayon of a Polish National and Territorial Rayon of the Same Name as Part of the Lithuanian SSR" and commissioned the presidium of the rayon soviet to develop a decree on this national rayon.

Mention was also made at the session that many of the rayon's residents are speaking out against the intention of the Lithuanian parliament to form volosts and uyezds and to divide up Vilnius Kray and join it to rayons with a Lithuanian population.

Inasmuch as Vilnius Kray is where Polish- and Russian-speaking populations reside in density, the deputies have spoken out against joining it to the other rayons of Lithuania. The rayon soviet believes that the most democratic decision of this question would be to form an administrative and territorial unit with its own charter confirmed by the appropriate law where Vilnius Kray's indigenous population reside in density.

Commenting on the decision of the deputies, A. Brodavskiy, chairman of the Vilniuskiy Rayon Soviet, told a TASS correspondent that the declaration of the act restoring Lithuanian state independence must not be considered the will of the people. The rayon's inhabitants have already felt the effects of this decision in full measure: Industrial enterprises and construction organizations have stopped working, material and technical supply of farms has almost stopped, the supply of basic goods, especially bread, flour, salt, and matches, to the rayon's population has worsened abruptly, and unemployment is growing.

Vilnius Radio Reports Moldavia's Recognition

LD3105221890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2045 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] today adopted a decision to recognize the independent republic of Lithuania. A total of 298 deputies took part in the Supreme Soviet session; 194 deputies voted in favor of this decision, 29 voted against, and 18 abstained.

Incidentally, the decision reads: The Supreme Soviet of the Moldavian SSR unconditionally recognizes the right of the Lithuanian nation, as well as any other nation, to self-determination and the setting up of an independent state. The Supreme Soviet recognizes the Supreme Council, the parliament of the republic of Lithuania, which had been legally and democratically elected by the people, as well as the government of the republic of Lithuania.

It was declared that Moldavia will not have any economic, financial, or any other claims to the republic of Lithuania should such problems arise. A wish to continue diplomatic, cultural, and political links with the republic of Lithuania was expressed. It was proposed to the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania to exchange permanent consulats.

The Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet demanded that the economic blockade against Lithuania should be discontinued and urged the government of the USSR and Lithuania to start a constructive dialogue.

Agreement Signed With Poland on Sugar, Oil

LD0106051890 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] A spokesman for the Lithuanian Ministry of Trade has announced that an agreement has been signed with Poland to buy their considerable quantities of high quality sugar and cooking oil. The deal was made after supplies of Cuban raw sugar were cut off for Lithuania and after it stopped receiving sunflower oil from the Ukraine.

The first delivery of vegetable oil has already reached Lithuania.

The spokesman for the Ministry of Trade pointed out that the prices both for sugar and cooking oil would be higher than before, as these products in Poland are pretty expensive.

Poland will also sell to Lithuania salt, a few varieties of baby food, footwear, clothes, and kitchen furniture.

Latvia To Begin Rationing Foodstuffs 1 June

AU3105171490 Paris AFP in English 1643 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Moscow, May 31 (AFP)—The Latvian government is to introduce rationing of basic foodstuffs from Friday [1 June] because of panic-buying which followed the Baltic republic's declaration of independence of May 4, the BALTIJA NEWS AGENCY reported here Thursday.

A coupon system will be introduced allowing citizens to buy up to 125 grams of pasta and 500 grams of oatmeal per month, according to the independent Baltic agency quoted by the Estonian news service.

The Riga municipality trade department said the list of shortages was growing daily.

Meanwhile, in neighbouring Lithuania, each district now gets hot water only once a week because of the energy crisis brought about by the Soviet blockade, the Estonian news service said.

Finally in Estonia, the third breakaway Baltic republic, an opinion poll of 900 people across the republic found that "green" ideology was most popular.

The "Mainor" public opinion research centre said that 39 per cent of respondents put environmental politics at the top of their list, while only eight per cent favoured communism or socialism.

Eighteen per cent backed social-democracy, 12 per cent Christian- democracy and 11 per cent liberalism. Conservative ideology scored three per cent and others two per cent. No question was asked about nationalism.

Latvian Government Takes Over Publishing House

LD3105174590 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga May 31 TASS—What will change in Latvia's largest publishing house, owned by the Soviet Communist Party, after its nationalisation? This question is being asked by all journalists working at the 24-story press house in Riga. On Wednesday the Latvian parliament decided to put the enterprise under the authority of the republic's government.

Journalists were divided on the issue, as were deputies. Economist Sergyey Dimanis, leader of the "Equality" faction, said the state's encroachment of the right of property will bring nothing good and may, particularly, undermine the trust of foreign firms and fledgling contacts with the Baltics.

The clause of the parliamentary resolution that instructs the republican government "to freeze" profits from CPSU publishing houses is highly controversial. Given the present centralised financial system, Moscow's reaction could be considerably more damaging, because the centre has more powers over the republic's finances.

Neither Dainis Ivans, first deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, nor Janis Skapars, chairman of a parliamentary commission, could say what article of the law was used to nationalise the press house.

Dimanis gave an unequivocal answer: "We won't find any law. This is a revolutionary act—expropriation..." It is obvious that this decision does not contribute to an ongoing quest for negotiations with the Soviet leadership being sought by Latvian leaders.

Baltics Foreign Affairs Commssions Hold Meeting

LD3105225790 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] A conference of representatives of parliamentary commissions on foreign affairs of the three Baltic republics was held in Vilnius for two days.

They came to the conclusion that such important issues as participation in the second Helsinki conference, invoilability of territories and the border issues, as well as the presence of Soviet armed forces on the territories of the Baltic states, the status of Soviet citizens there and others can be considered only after they are coordinated and discussed by each of the three republics' parliamentary commissions.

RSFSR

Yeltsin, Landsbergis Discuss Possible Ties

LD0106121190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia, met Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania in Moscow today at 0700. Edigijus Bickauskas, the permanent representative of Lithuania in Moscow, has informed us that questions concerning the prospect of Russian-Lithuanian ties and possible forms of cooperation were discussed at the meeting.

Boris Isayev Elected Deputy Chairman

LD0106075390 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—55-year-old Boris Isayev, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Regional Council in Chelyabinsk, South Urals, has been elected deputy chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, the vote-counting commission reported today.

He was the only candidate to win more than 50 per cent of votes in the election, held on Thursday, in which the first deputy and three deputies of parliament chairman Boris Yeltsin were to be named.

Today, the second round of elections will be held. Ramazan Abdulatipov of Dagestan, Northern Caucasus; and Vladimir Shtygashev of Khakassia, Siberia, run for first deputy chairman.

Four candidates run for the remaining two posts of deputy chairmen.

Moscow TV Relays 31 May Congress Proceedings

Amendments Proposed

LD3105165690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 31 May begins carrying a recorded relay of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) People's Congress session in Moscow.

At 1430 Yeltsin asks the deputies to stand as a mark of respect to the Russian flag. They stand briefly. Yeltsin asks the deputies to register: 795 deputies are present, making a quorum. On the agenda is the election of first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the other deputy chairmen. The conciliation commission has proposed an amendment to the RSFSR Constitution: that the first deputy chairman and other deputies be elected.

At 1436 GMT Deputy Golushko says there have been worries over the exchange of messages between Gorbachev and Yeltsin. He says the view that the Democratic Russia bloc has come to power is incorrect. Yeltsin was backed by a coalition of forces. At the conciliation commission Yeltsin displayed a spirit of compromise, he says. However, he has been adopting tactics reminiscent of the Directoire period of the French Revolution. Yeltsin has no right to make unilateral statements without the sanction of the congress or Supreme Soviet, he adds. The first messages between Gorbachev and Yeltsin are reminiscent of a story by Gogol, he notes.

At 1442 GMT an unidentified man in a military uniform reads out a message from Ufa factory workers about the local atomic power station and rejecting the government's economic reform platform. He notes a concern about euphoria over the disappearance of military threats from abroad. The RSFSR concept for a transfer to market conditions is required, and the Army should have social guarantees. The Army shouldn't be divided regionally. There should be proper conditions for Army personnel returning from abroad. He appeals to Yeltsin to save the Soviet Union, and not to confront it.

At 1446 GMT Yeltsin says we're dealing with the conciliation commission's proposal on a constitutional amendment: There is a first deputy chairman and deputy chairmen, not just one deputy chairman, to be elected.

At 1451 GMT Deputy Kharayev makes a proposal on the use of an electronic voting system for the elections.

At 1452 GMT Deputy Ambartsumov backs Yeltsin's proposal on the amendment. As a representative of the Democratic Russia bloc, Ambartsumov says Yeltsin was democratically elected. Now that Yeltsin has set out his views, it is clear he wants a strong Union based on strong individual republics, and Gorbachev should meet Yeltsin half-way, he adds.

At 1456 GMT Yeltsin says he is no longer a member of the Democratic Russia group.

At 1457 GMT Deputies Serin and Slobodkin intervene briefly on the proposed amendments.

At 1501 GMT Deputy Varov from Leningrad claims the proposed amendments are insignificant but coalition and consensus have been talked about for too long. These amendments represent the first step toward unity for Russia, he says.

AT 1503 GMT Deputy Timofeyev says the amendments are necessary and speaks about the voting procedure to be adopted.

AT 1505 GMT Deputy Rumyantsev speaks about the work done by the conciliation committee set up yesterday. It reached agreement on the issue of expanding the number of deputy chairmen. This issue is now to be resubmitted by the committee to the congress, which must also consider matters connected with the Constitution.

AT 1509 GMT Deputy Desyatnikov comments on the proposed constitutional amendments.

At 1511 GMT an unidentified deputy makes brief comments.

AT 1512 GMT Yeltsin asks deputies to vote on whether to finish discussion: 846 for, 34 against, four abstain.

The deputies then vote on whether to vote on the amendments: 526 vote for, 355 against, 17 abstain. Yeltsin then asks the deputies to vote on whether to adopt the amendment on the election of a deputy chairman. Voting is suspended due to a fault in the electronic display system.

At 1524 GMT an unidentified speaker talks about the situation in Armenia, and asks for deputies to rise to honor the dead in Armenia.

Deputy Chairmen Nominated

LD3105175290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1527 GMT on 31 May continues carrying a recorded relay of the RSFSR People's Congress session in Moscow.

At 1527 GMT Deputy Babayev calls for stricter measures against terrorists in Armenia to be announced in a statement.

At 1528 GMT an unidentified deputy says that a statement is not needed and may inflame the situation.

At 1529 GMT another deputy calls for a commission to be set up to look into what is happening in Armenia.

At 1530 GMT Deputy Tarazov attacks attempts to criticize the legitimate leadership in Armenia.

At 1532 GMT Yeltsin asks deputies to vote on whether or not to adopt the statement: 846 for, 34 against and four abstentions. The decision is adopted: not to send the statement.

At 1536 GMT Yeltsin asks deputies to register: 896 are present, 707 represent the quorum.

At 1538 GMT Deputy Tambov, who took part in the work of the preparatory committee, speaks about work done on the wording of the amendment.

At 1542 Yeltsin calls for voting to take place now on the proposed amendment to the Constitution on the election of deputy chairmen: 747 for, 145 against, 18 abstentions—the decision is adopted.

At 1545 GMT Yeltsin announces four candidates for deputy chairman: Shtygashev, Abdulatipov, Gabitov, and Mukhamediyev.

At 1548 GMT Deputy (Buslov) speaks in favor of the candidacy of Abdulatipov.

At 1549 GMT unidentified deputy asks that all candidates speak before a decision is taken.

At 1550 GMT Abdulatipov presents his program.

At 1558 GMT Yeltsin asks that deputies vote on whether candidates should answer questions: 432 for, 393 against, 11 abstentions—decision not adopted, deputies are not to answer questions.

At 1615 GMT Deputy Gabitov gives a speech, who is standing for first deputy chairman. He says that he has always backed sovereignty for Russia and economic independence as part of a radical economic reform. He says he wants constructive dialogue and cooperation with all political currents. Then he says he wants his candidacy to be withdrawn: He will work hard as a deputy.

At 1620 GMT Mukhamadiyev, another candidate, says that the old mechanisms of Russian sovereignty have broken down. The RSFSR can't continue to play the role of mere raw materials supplier. There must be a change of attitude toward education, culture and intellectual values. A misguided state policy has been pursued for decades.

At 1626 GMT Shtygashev, the fourth candidate, says that laws must be adopted on the sovereignty of Russia and the independence of enterprises. Qualities needed for the job: patience, decisiveness, competence. He says he'll be able to deal with Yeltsin's personality. There is a written question about why he left the militia: "At my own request," is the reply.

At 1633 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether to proceed with a discussion of the candidates for first deputy chairman. Result: 279 for. So there won't be a discussion.

At 1635 GMT a deputy speaks on behalf of farming deputies: Only Democratic Russia bloc candidates have been put forward for the deputy chairman jobs. And why are farming interests not represented? He proposes a woman—Ivanova.

At 1639 GMT Yeltsin says that no agreement was broken about women candidates and he hasn't taken into account Democratic Russia membership in putting forward candidates.

At 1641 GMT a member of the conciliation commission says that the list of candidates raises doubts and is disappointing. There must be a woman in the government. He proposes Goryacheva and Ivanova.

At 1644 GMT an unidentified deputy says that the chairman is in too much of a rush to change the Constitution. The list of candidates shows that Yeltsin is repaying debts to the people who helped to elect him, and this won't promote the conciliation that Yeltsin himself has advocated. He says that Yeltsin should put Vlasov on the list of candidates.

At 1647 GMT Yeltsin says that he can't agree that he is "hostage" to anyone. No deals were done over the list of candidates. An interval in the session is announced.

Candidates Speak

LD3105184790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1649 GMT on 31 May continues carrying a recorded relay of RSFSR People's Congress session in Moscow.

At 1649 GMT Deputy Grachev, speaking for the Secretariat, reads out a statement expressing concern over the switch to market conditions. The congress will resist all attempts to lower the standard of living in the RSFSR.

At 1652 GMT Deputy Petrov says it is too early to adopt the statement, because the government has not yet adopted the program.

At 1653 GMT Deputy Voyskov says the congress shouldn't adopt the statement.

At 1654 GMT Deputy Lisin says the government should be given a firm deadline.

At 1655 GMT another deputy says he supports the text of the statement. The "inhuman" reforms should not be imposed.

At 1656 GMT another deputy says a commission of professionals should examine the alternatives to the government economic reform package.

At 1657 GMT Deputy Antonov says he is surprised that the congress is not sticking to the agenda and has become side-tracked. The issue of the statement should be properly debated.

At 1659 GMT Yeltsin proposes a vote on whether to adopt this proposal. He says "messages are coming in from all over Russia." For: 719. Thus, the issue of the statement on the economic package will be discussed later.

At 1700 GMT Deputy Antonov continues. Why haven't we heard from anyone representing industry?

At 1702 GMT a women deputy asks what happened to the women candidates who were on the list yesterday.

At 1703 GMT Deputy (Sadyk) asks why are the candidates mainly from the party apparatus or academics? He proposes additional names.

At 1704 GMT Deputy Medvedev says what counts is the individual qualities of the candidate, not where he comes from or what he does. Yeltsin has the right to whittle down the list on the basis of practical qualities.

At 1706 GMT Deputy Ryumin says he attended the conciliation commission session and can say that all the Democratic Russia proposals were rejected. Democratic Russia backs any proposal put forward by the chairman.

At 1709 GMT Deputy Repin suggests people shouldn't line up to speak—it makes a bad impression. He says that the commission backed Yeltsin's proposal yesterday that three candidates should be voted on.

At 1711 GMT another deputy says that the result of the compromise between Democratic Russia and communist blocs was that the first deputy chairman candidates were not members of Democratic Russia. Let's not keep threatening Yeltsin.

At 1713 GMT Yeltsin proposes vote on terminating the debate. For: 779. Yeltsin says he agrees that we shouldn't form lines and copy the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Let's use all the available microphones in the body of the hall.

At 1715 GMT Deputy Skudnov asks whether Deputy Goryacheva is on the list of candidates.

At 1716 GMT an official for the Secretariat apologizes for certain mistakes in candidates' biographies.

At 1717 GMT Denisenko, Domnina and Koryagina remain on the list, Yeltsin says.

At 1718 GMT Deputy Denisenko says that we are at a transitional period between an old system that no longer works, and a new one that is still at the embryonic stage. RSFSR people's deputies have an important role to play in pursuing reform. The deputy chairman for work with commissions and committees must make sure the RSFSR parliament does not lag behind a rapidly moving situation.

At 1725 GMT Yeltsin clarifies what the domain of responsibilities of the individual deputy chairman is.

At 1727 GMT Deputy Domnina thanks deputies for nominating her. The Yeltsin program can't be implemented without legal reform. We must not enact stillborn laws, as has happened on Union level. The supremacy of the law will protect people: Only free people can implement the program for the national rebirth of Russia. A declaration on the sovereignty of Russia should be adopted at the congress. As a lawyer, she knows how to listen to others. Here conscience is clear.

At 1733 GMT Deputy Koryagina says she is aware of the difficulty of the present situation. This is the last in a long series of attempts to bring Russia into the civilized family of nations. She says the burden of the Ryzhkov package should not be borne by ordinary people. The structure of the national economy must be changed in the direction of demonoplization. Debts are mounting and we are ceasing to be reliable partners for foreign banks. We must combine the interests of the parliament and people on a basis of consolidation.

At 1740 GMT Yeltsin says the next candidates for deputy chairmen are Isayev, Nikitayev and Churilov.

At 1742 GMT a deputy says Deputy Doyev is also on the list. Yeltsin says he should be on the next list, instead of Medvedev.

At 1743 GMT Isayev says he would like to help lead the good ship Russia out of its crisis. A communist, he says he has visited many areas of the RSFSR in his capacity as a ministry official. He believes in Russian sovereignty, and agrees with Yeltsin's platform on many points. Russia faces many problems: We need accord among peoples and ethnic groups.

Speeches Continue

LD3105203190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1749 GMT on 31 May continues carrying a recorded relay of the RSFSR People's Congress session in Moscow.

At 1749 GMT candidate Nikitayev describes his academic and teaching background. The important goal is to consolidate the different groups of deputies. He says he has experience of cooperation between different republics. He realizes the responsibility involved in doing the job, but he is ready to share this responsibility with the chairman, deputy chairmen and with deputies.

At 1755 GMT candidate Churilov says his slogan is the rebirth of Russia through justice and cooperation. He backs deputies' clubs. He will use his experience of the Tyumen oil and gas complex to good effect, if elected.

At 1801 GMT Yeltsin says the next three candidates include Doyev.

AT 1802 GMT Doyev says he was brought up an orphan and expresses gratitude for his nomination. He says he is a communist and does not belong to any factions. He has been involved in planning and budget work in North Ossetiya.

At 1806 GMT candidate Shakhray, 34, says the Supreme Soviet can't be elected without contravening the RSFSR Constitution. He says he is an expert on parliamentary organization.

AT 1811 GMT candidate Yarov talks of moral responsibility before future generations. Power comes and goes, but the people remain. We must take decisions in their name. Consolidation should be the keynote of our efforts.

At 1816 GMT there is a break in the recorded relay and correspondent Veselkov is shown interviewing a deputy who says he is the second oldest deputy, after Nikita Sergeyevich Tolstoy. He says he has a mandate from his electors to promote the restoration of the autonomy of the Karachayevo people. Veselkov then interviews a Dagestan student, who is the youngest deputy, in the Smena group to which he belongs. Young deputies Plotnikov and Mikailov are also interviewed. Deputy Gurevich is interviewed on his views of the functioning of the conciliation commission. He says Yeltsin has renounced his constitutional right to pick his deputies.

At 1827 GMT Yeltsin says the tellers' commission isn't ready yet.

AT 1828 GMT Deputy Zakharovich says he's unhappy about the way the first deputy chairman candidates were debated. He asks that time be allotted for the three candidates to answer questions.

AT 1830 GMT an unidentified deputy reads out a telegram about nuclear contamination in Bryansk Oblast and problems with builders from other regions.

At 1832 GMT a woman deputy "categorically objects" to the way women were put forward for the deputy chairman posts. video shows ironic smiles from male deputies.

At 1835 GMT Yeltsin says that all the candidates for first deputy, including those nominated and agreed by women, turned out to be men.

At 1836 GMT a deputy comes to the microphone and says he is neither left nor right, but an industrial worker.

At 1837 GMT Yeltsin says the tellers' commission needs another hour.

At 1838 GMT Deputy Akhmadzhanov says procurement prices should not be raised, as this will have a knock-on effect on retail prices.

At 1839 GMT Deputy Alekseyev proposes a group be set up to examine the prices issue.

At 1840 GMT Yeltsin again appeals for aspiring speakers not to form lines. Yeltsin says the congress is not seeking confrontation with the Union authorities, but merely responding to the worries of electors. He reads out a statement of "concern" over the planned price rises. The congress hopes that the USSR Supreme Soviet will opt for reform without lowering people's standard of living. The idea is to reassure the peoples of the RSFSR.

At 1843 GMT Deputy (Babayev) says we should not be preempting events—the Ryzhkov plan is still under discussion.

At 1844 GMT Deputy Vazenko says a statement should be adopted because the people must be reassured.

AT 1846 GMT Deputy Yaroshenko says the statement must be adopted now: later will be too late.

At 1847 GMT Deputy Karin says an appeal to the Armenian people must be drafted today Yeltsin says the appeal is being worked on.

Procedural Matters Debated

LD3105220190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1848 GMT on 31 May continues carrying a recorded relay of the RSFSR People's Congress session in Moscow.

At 1848 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on whether to take the statement on the Ryzhkov package "as a basis." The vote shows: 546 for, 214 against, 36 abstentions.

At 1851 GMT an official for the Secretariat says names of potential candidates for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and its committees and commissions should be submitted. He outlines the subject matter of deputies' questions, including points for USSR ministers, which are listed.

At 1900 GMT Deputy Chernykh wonders what happened to some of the other names nominated for the deputy chairman posts.

At 1902 GMT Yeltsin explains that the idea was for the conciliation committee to put forward names, and the chairman would use his constitutional right to narrow the list down to three. This was approved by the 200 members of the conciliation committee.

At 1904 GMT a deputy says that people in his constituency are worried about the Moscow clamp-down on shoppers from out of town.

At 1908 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on whether to have question-and-answer sessions with each of the candidates for first deputy. Deputies vote not to have such sessions.

At 1910 GMT Deputy Andryukov says the situation over the Moscow shop clamp-down is unpredictable.

At 1914 GMT Deputy (Byanov) speaks about concern about the combat readiness of the Armed Forces and social problems faced by servicemen and their families.

At 1918 GMT another deputy criticizes the amount of money and time wasted by deputies and calls for a more efficient information system to be introduced.

At 1920 GMT another deputy makes a point about the microphones and expresses his dissatisfaction about the fact that the deputy chairman will probably not be an ethnic Russian and requests that the idea of two deputy chairmen be considered in order that one Russian and one non-Russian may be elected.

At 1922 GMT Yeltsin rejects this request—ethnicity is not important.

At 1923 GMT Deputy Shushkov criticizes the disordered manner in which discussions are proceeding. The agenda must be followed to a far greater extent.

At 1925 GMT Yeltsin states that procedures cannot be determined completely beforehand, flexibility in the agenda is needed.

At 1926 GMT Deputy Samoylov speaks about Children's Day which is to be marked tomorrow and the fact that more protection is needed for children in the law.

At 1931 GMT a deputy corrects an error in Koryagina's biography—she is nonaligned rather than a CPSU member. He also announces that candidates for the post of chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers will speak today at a meeting here at 2130 Moscow time between economists and industrialists.

At 1933 GMT Deputy Vershinin talks about the natural disaster which recently occurred in Irkutsk Oblast and the damage inflicted.

At 1936 GMT another deputy makes a number of points.

At 1938 GMT Yeltsin announces the rescinding of the Mossoviets (Moscow City Soviet) foodstuffs restrictions.

At 1941 GMT Deputy (Chouskiy) criticizes the slowness of work and proposes that voting take place on the idea of working from 0900-1900 with only a two hour break.

At 1942 GMT Yeltsin says that this would be against the rules but deputies will have to work on Saturday and asks deputies to vote on this: 436 for, 280 against—the decision to work on Saturday is not passed. Yeltsin wonders if the question was properly understood and requests a repeat vote: 428 for, 309 against—the decision is again not passed. Yeltsin decides to declare Saturday a working day anyway.

At 1947 GMT the chairman of the tellers' commission speaks about the procedure for secret balloting.

At 1948 GMT Yeltsin declares today's session closed.

Yeltsin Reports Repeal of Foodstuffs Restriction

LD3105221190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1938 GMT 31 May 90

[Announcement by Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet at the 31 May session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies—recorded]

[Text] Comrades, I would like to report some information just given me concerning the Moscow Soviet and the work being carried out there now. So, negotiations have been carried out with Kalinin Oblast, and joint proposals from the Moscow Soviet and the leadership of Kalinin Oblast have been sent to the Council of Ministers with regard to the reallocation of funds.

Further, at present, negotiations are being carried out with Yaroslavl Oblast. Tomorrow there will be negotiations from 1000 [0600 GMT] with Vladimir, Ryazan, Kaluga, Tula, Kostroma and Smolensk.

Besides this, the Moscow Soviet, changing the decision adopted earlier on Sunday [as heard], has rescinded all restrictions on the sale of all items by presentation of passport.

I do not consider this an exhaustive response. But evidently we will have to wait and see how the negotiations go tomorrow and then return to this question.

Congress Adopts Statement on Price Reform

LD3105213390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1840 GMT 31 May 90

[Remarks by Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, at the 31 May session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies—recorded]

[Excerpts] Comrades, since we touched on this issue [of prices] a mass of telegrams has begun to arrive. And, you see, our statement did not amount to the fact that we are, so to speak, in confrontation with the Union government, but we are responding to our voters' indignation and dissatisfaction. The more so, since now with every hour already a very dangerous situation is developing and forming in certain regions. According to the accord which we had, the group has worked on the text and I ask you to listen to it very attentively. If we adopt this, then this would somehow calm Russia's population, but would simultaneously open up to us the opportunity of a dialogue with the Union government on further discussion of this issue.

I will read it.

Statement of the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. The First Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR expresses serious concern in connection with the projected transfer proposed by the USSR Government to a market economy, particularly with regard to raising prices on basic foodstuffs and other consumer goods. The congress expresses the hope that, having thoroughly studied the plan of the Union government, the USSR Supreme Soviet will adopt a considered decision that will make it possible to carry out profound economic reform without risking lowering our peoples' standard of living. We are prepared for constructive cooperation on this issue with the Government and the USSR Supreme Soviet. The congress charges the new RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the republican government with developing alternative versions of the development of market relations in the national economy of the Russian Federation and putting them forward for discussion.

It seems to me that this offends neither the government nor the Supreme Soviet, is quite constructive, and withal is aimed at calming the peoples of our Russian Federation. Should we distribute it or vote? [passage omitted]

Comrades, there is a proposal to vote, nonetheless, correct? We here, I say once more, are not entering into a confrontation. We are not abrogating one decision. All we are saying is: When adopting decisions, consult Russia's highest body of authority—the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation. Then I ask you to vote to adopt this statement as a basis. [video shows electronic teller with the following figures: for 546; against 214; abstentions 36; total 796. Decision adopted.]

So, the decision is adopted.

'Clashes of Differing Views' at Congress Noted

LD3105145290 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, in session for more than two weeks, has certainly made progress, but each step takes much effort.

Clashes of differing views, sometimes directly opposing, on Russia's development occur both during the debates and in the lobbies.

For the first time in decades, the work of the Russian parliament is marked by a true plurality of opinion: Dozens of deputies' groups have been registered by the Secretariat of the republic's supreme legislature.

"We unite more than 430 deputies," Igor Bratishchev, head of the group Communists of Russia, told TASS. "We represent virtually all areas of the republic and social sections of the population."

The formation of groups which represent all hues of opinion will pave the way to the consolidation of Russian deputies, he believes.

Bratishchev spoke highly of the work of the conciliation commission set up at the congress to draft compromise proposals on the composition of the parliamentary leadership.

"The situation at the congress will improve if the commission's effective work continues," he said.

Viktor Sheinis, a prominent activist of the Democratic Russia bloc, disagrees. "A conciliation commission of 200 members is nonsense," he said.

Sheinis believes that the best way is to start the discussion of candidates to top positions within a narrow circle, something that "leading world democracies do."

In addition, a group of independent deputies has emerged. "having analysed the situation at the congress, we decided to set up a centre group," explains one of the initiators of the group, Yuriy Matochkin.

"Our goal is to establish a club where deputies would be able to consider problems proceeding from the interests of all, the interests of Russia, without subscribing to extreme left or extreme right views," he said.

Further Congress Criticism of Yeltsin Cited

LD3105123390 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Axenov and Igor Yefimov report from the Kremlin:

Today's morning meeting of the Russian Federation's Congress of People's Deputies, presided over by the new chairman of Russia's Parliament Boris Yeltsin, illustrated that far from all his initiatives will be supported by deputies.

Leader of the Democratic Russia radical bloc, Yeltsin was elected chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet in the third round with a four vote margin over the necessary minimum. He won 535 votes, while 502 voted against him, demonstrating the polarisation of political forces at the congress.

At the beginning of today's meeting deputy Ivan Galushko from the Jewish autonomous region criticised Yeltsin's press conference on Wednesday. Many delegates seconded his opinion. The parliament's president "is not entitled to make personal statements on these issues, without the approval of the Supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies and on some issues—of the entire republican population."

The congress then turned to discussion of candidates for the posts of the first deputy (three contenders) and three deputies (nine contenders).

Aleksandr Nazarchuk, a representative of the agrarian deputy group, said that the chairman, contrary to yesterday's accord reached at the conciliation commission, gave preference to Democratic Russia bloc representatives on the list of candidates.

Nazarchuk was supported by Deputy Vladimir Babichev, who stressed that Yeltsin "is in a hurry to pay due to the Democratic Russia group which helped him get elected to the post." After a heated discussion it was decided that everyone has the right to express his attitude towards the candidates during the secret ballot.

Less than four hours into the session, congress secretariat director Vladimir Grachev unexpectedly read out the congress's draft statement about the Soviet Government's plan to change over to a market economy. It was proposed on behalf of the congress to declare "a firm determination to oppose any attempts to carry out any economic transformations on republican territory that lead to a reduction in the living standards of the Russian Federation's peoples."

Some deputies supported the draft statement. But many agreed with Gorno-Altay Deputy Vladimir Petrov, who was against approval of this document, since the final decision has yet to be taken at the Union level. Addressing Yeltsin, the deputy warned him that "he should not begin by confronting the Union government." The delegates then voted to return to the issue later.

The parliament president's first deputy and deputies are expected to be elected by secret ballot in the afternoon.

Implications of Yeltsin Election Analyzed

PM0106091090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Pavel Gutiontov "Political Diary" column: "After the Choice"]

[Text] So two days ago Russia's Supreme Soviet finally acquired a chairman.

There is probably no need to remind you how difficult, tense, and nerve-wracking the elections were: It seemed that there would be no end to the string of nominations and votes, hopes of a reasonable compromise faded, and the congress was sailing full steam ahead into a constitutional impasse....

Suffice it to say that in the end the fate of the highest state post in the biggest republic in the Union was decided by the votes of only four deputies. And this result in itself, I am afraid, predetermines a difficult future for the Russian parliament and promises a heated struggle, which will inevitably break out at the sessions whenever any question of importance is discussed.

This makes it all the more important, it seems to me, to understand this: What did the results of the elections at the congress that brought victory to Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin show, what did they prove? Incidentally, the "Democratic Russia" bloc, which nominated Yeltsin as its candidate, is in a clear minority in the congress and is represented by barely one-fourth of the body of deputies....

First of all the results of the vote showed clearly that the process of democratization of society is steadily gathering speed. And moreover the congress reflected the mood in a society rocked by crisis phenomena and disappointed in the inconsistency of the reforms and the absence, stemming from this inconsistency, of real results. The store of confidence in those who again proposed at this congress to "wait a little longer" is running low. You have tried and it did not work, now let others have a try, perhaps it will work for them—such ideas are being expressed increasingly insistently among the masses.

So when Yeltsin put forward his program at the congress, this program was bound to make a considerably greater impression than, for instance, the package of measures proposed by the present chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, whose name, rightly or wrongly, is inevitably associated with the state of affairs in the republic.

And another important factor. Now that the processes of polarization of forces in society have reached threatening dimensions, Yeltsin, in addressing the congress (in contrast to a great many of his former public statements), chose, it seemed to me, not to deepen the confrontation, but to proclaim a course of cooperation. Not to settle scores for past injuries, but to seek the way to consensus.

In fact, to be frank, I do not think I can remember Boris Nikolayevich adopting such a conciliatory tone as he did at this congress. And this conciliatory attitude undoubtedly made a favorable impression on the deputies who voted for him.

It is quite possible that this was a tactical move used in the election contest. Perhaps that is the case. It should, I hope, be clear to the new chairman that it was these tactics that brought him victory. And only this approach, now and in future, can lead to fruitful work by the Russian parliament, where (and we have seen this repeatedly) it is so easy to destroy the unsteady equilibrium with not much more than a single awkward rejoinder.

So it would be nice to believe that it was no accident that Yeltsin's first step in his new capacity was to convene a conciliating commission of representatives of all the deputies' groups and blocs formed at the congress. He repeated that in existing conditions he will not insist on his constitutional right himself to name candidates for the top posts, and that he prefers to nominate those on whom the broadest possible consensus can be reached.

Well, of course, not even this path is strewn with roses, but let us repeat yet again that this is probably the only promising path capable of helping us to avoid impasses and splits leading to bitterness in society and the inability to resolve the problems it faces. I think it is worth saying this yet again, because B.N. Yeltsin's speech at his first press conference in his new capacity reminded us that opposing views still exist, and furthermore on some points the confrontation has become even more distinct and clearly defined. This applies first and foremost to the interpretation of the concept of "sovereignty," which, according to Yeltsin's formula, entails the threat of the virtual breakup of the Union. But will this idea be supported by the congress and the Supreme Soviet, which have to resolve radical questions like this? I also found some of the assessments of the central government to be far from correct; the sweeping and uncompromising nature of certain constitutional ideas could also, I fear, complicate the relationship that is just beginning to form between the chairman and the parliament. "Shock" formulas geared to demonstrations are only any good when you are fighting for power. Now, as L'HUMANITE rightly says, "having become head of the Russian parliament, Yeltsin must realize that from now on he will not always be able to shift the blame for failures of policy onto Gorbachev's shoulders alone."

But all the same. One may have mixed feelings about the fact of B.N. Yeltsin's election. But it is still a fact, and will have to be reckoned with from now on. This is all the more necessary in that Russia's role and place in our Union cannot be underestimated or belittled (and it would be incredibly dangerous to do so). Yeltsin is no longer an opposition leader today. Discussion of his merits and demerits (to which, in my view, too much attention has been paid) should give way to the evaluation of the state of affairs and the quest for consensus and mutual compromises.

Article Assesses Yeltsin Victory

PM0106080590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 p 1

[S. Kiselev article: "'Not Fighting Against One's Own People,' Boris Yeltsin Stated at his First Press Conference"]

[Text] I increasingly think that even if the lord god himself were in charge of our reforms, he would hear from the earth cries of "Step down!" and "Retire!" And this would not in any way be because god was politically ignorant or economically incompetent, but solely because we did not believe in him. Belief... okay, call it confidence, is the prime, supreme condition of all reforms. And even if a politician is as wise as Solomon and surrounded by 100 academicians, unless the people have confidence in him he will not be able to take a single step without stumbling and falling. If only one also knew how to measure this confidence...

The scales were tipped in favor of one of the contenders for the post of chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] by 0.4 percent of the votes. The Russian Congress elected Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin its leader.

He ceased to be a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and was released from the post of first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom [City Party Committee] two and one-half years ago. Two years ago he asked that the 19th All-Union Party Conference politically rehabilitate him. One year ago he became a USSR People's deputy after receiving a record number of votes—almost 5 million!—in the election in the prestigious Moscow City National Territorial District No. 1. He then became a cochairman of the Interregional Deputies' Group and quite recently a member of the Coordinating Council of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU. This March, outstripping his 14 rivals in the first round, he became a people's deputy of the Russian Federation, and the day before yesterday he became chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Will the political situation in the country change now that Yeltsin heads the Supreme Soviet of the biggest republic in the Union? "It will undoubtedly do so," Boris Nikolayevich told journalists immediately after his election.

His first political step was to confirm the promises he had given: Yesterday the new RSFSR Supreme Soviet, having abandoned the method of "handing out portfolios on a cabinet basis," started consultations with deputies' groups on the candidacies of deputy chairmen. Having experienced for himself what it is to be in opposition, Yeltsin has shown his readiness for the sake of a policy of consensus to overcome emotion and conduct dialogue with those who are now in the minority. Dialogue, despite the fact that many offensive words have been addressed to him in recent days.

So where does Yeltsin's strength lie? Not in the 0.4 percent margin which enabled him to take charge of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. He himself feels it lies in the support of the people and, by all accounts, intends to graphically demonstrate this: Next May Yeltsin proposes holding a direct and secret general election for the presidency of the RSFSR. And then not the deputies but the people themselves will nominate the politician to whom they entrust the republic's fate.

Yeltsin Holds 30 May Moscow News Conference

LD3005211990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 May 90

[News conference held by Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Boris Yeltsin in Moscow—live]

[Text] [Yeltsin] Esteemed comrades, esteemed gentlemen: The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, of deputies elected for the first time on an almost democratic basis—1,060 deputies—is being held. It should be said that the congress is taking place in a fairly energetic and democratic fashion and for the first time not according to a scenario devised beforehand by the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet and its commissions.

The proposed standing orders have been seriously adjusted. They contain such additional issues as the report-back of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation and its chairman, the issue of Russia's sovereignty, of the decree on power, the issue for discussion of our agrarian question, and a number of other fundamental questions now being discussed and [pauses] the Supreme Soviet chairman has been elected. Half of yesterday and today there have been consultations with representatives of all deputies' groups—there are 26 of them—and national-territorial formations, territories, in all some 200 persons, consultations have been held on the ratification of cadres, of first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, deputy chairmen of the Supreme Soviet, chairman of the Council of Ministers, well, to put it more briefly, those candidacies ratified by the congress.

This is perhaps the first time—not including the 1920s—the first time in our parliamentary practice that the leadership of the Supreme Soviet and the heads of its committees and commissions and the government are being formed as it were on a coalition basis. For us the very word is quite new. Perhaps we will later think up some Russian word but as yet we use one from the lexicon of Western democracy.

It should be said that all of today we have been consulting and although it has not always gone simply, it has shown that it was needed, this council, as a democratic and open form of discussion of candidacies preliminarily until the congress, so as to give up those stereotypes which existed in our country and which still exist and including, remember how we discussed and tackled the question of ratification of various cadres at the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Union when only the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman proposed one candidacy, only one candidacy, was proposed by only one.

Now there will be a somewhat different situation. Of all the candidacies which were nominated today, each of them had his say. It was discussed, and then the Supreme Soviet chairmen granted the right to propose to the congress, from this list, on an alternative basis, for first deputy four candidatures and three candidatures each for the Russian Supreme Soviet deputy chairmen.

That was the kind of form that was chosen today. On the whole I must say the congress is going well, although not without some organizational disruptions and in keeping with the Constitution the first session must be conducted by Vasiliy Ivanovich Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission. This first session went on for 11 and a half days, and only on the 12th day the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman was elected and accordingly he has started to conduct the congress.

I would end on that and I await your questions.

[Text] [(Vechernikogay]) (Andrey Nikolayevich Vechernikogay), KOMSOMOLETS TATARII. Boris Nikolayevich, on my behalf and on behalf of my colleagues I congratulate you on being elected to such a lofty post and I would like to ask you this: Your nearly four year-old dispute with representatives of traditional thinking has ended in your complete triumph, one could say. I should like to hear, in this regard, your assessment of the role of the mass information media in this whole drawn out story. Thank you.

[Yeltsin] The role of the mass information media in covering the congress?

[(Vechernikogay]) No, I mean in the whole four-year story. [words indistinct]

[Yeltsin] In the whole country, yes?

[(Vechernikogay)] [mutters agreement]

[Yeltsin] I nevertheless would like to speak with reference to Russia in answering this question as I see it. Russia should have, and I think it will aquire, real sovereignty, and will adopt a declaration on sovereignty and a decree on power, and it will finally have its own independent domestic and foreign policy, its own television on an alternative basis, radio, press, and of course we will certainly not drag in the adoption of a law on freedom of the press and the mass media on a Union level. It will be one of the priority laws.

How do the mass media demolish the conservative way of thinking? Well, I think different newspapers and different mass information media do it different ways. You know that perfectly well yourself. But I think that in this respect a high rating is maintained by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, AND ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. OGONEK is intermittent in its success but, nevertheless, does sometimes demolish it. RODINA is not consistent but sometimes makes itself felt. In television, apart from VZGLYAD [VIEW] and Leningrad Television, I do not think there is any demolishing as yet.

[Ostrovskiy] Novosti Press Agency, Ostrovskiy. Boris Nikolayevich, I have two questions for you. First, what important steps or decisions will you take in your first 100 days as chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet? Second, what is your attitude toward combining the posts of chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Russian Communist Party? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Let me start with the second question. I am an opponent of combining any posts—[soviet] chairman and party secretary be it on the Russian, or oblast, or city, or rayon level. I think this institution will gradually fall out of use. It will be the real transfer of power to the people and the soviets, and the chairman of the soviet and the soviet will be the main authority in a given territory. On the first question concerning the 100 days, I have not calculated in terms of 100 days, because you could then ask about 101 days!

Nevertheless, the first steps, aside from personnel matters, will have to involve forming the leadership of the Supreme Soviet and its committees and commissions, and a new and viable government which will enjoy the confidence of the people. Regrettably, the Union government and leadership are currently losing the confidence of the people. That is why no appeals are now saving us from the bacchanalian orgy currently under way involving the buying up of everything people can get their hands on, following the announcement of forthcoming price rises. I think the congress will make a decision that we will not opt for this way of raising prices, as the Ukraine has decided. We must discover what forms and mechanisms exist for switching to a market economy that would not reduce the standard of living of the population. The next step is the sovereignty of Russia—in the very broad sense of the term, moreover. We must hold out against the diktat of the center. If we hold out for 100 days, if the center, using all possible measures, fails to topple us within 100 days, then, proceeding on the basis of the declaration on sovereignty and the basic principles that will be passed here, and subsequently the adoption of the relevant laws, Russia will be independently adopting its decisions on everything. Russian laws must be above Union ones. The Russian Constitution must be adopted prior to the

Union Constitution, and then, if there are any discrepancies, let the relevant constitutional commissions pinpoint them and issue proposals on how to get out of the situation. Then there will be the relevant conclusion of treaties with foreign states, bypassing the center, and above all with our neighbors. Further, there are questions connected with deputies' status. I believe Russian deputies ought to have no less resources, so to speak, for their work, but the leadership of the Supreme Soviet, government and committees, on the other hand, should have significantly less, several times less than the Union leadership. In Russia this differential should be a small one. In this way we will save money from the Russian budget for the upkeep of the apparatus of the entire Supreme Soviet and deputies, and simultaneously will not reduce the opportunities of ordinary, or rather people's deputies, members of the Supreme Soviet and members of the committees and commissions, for going about their work.

Further, we have to have our own, Russian interpretation of the laws on land, ownership and the independence of enterprises. Subsequent steps from which we have already received an impetus today are treaties with those Union republics which consent to them. In other words, we must conclude 14 treaties, if 14 Union republics consent to do so: a direct treaty on all areas, economic, trade, scientific and technical and cultural ties, questions of nationalities, refugee issues, and so on, and so forth. We must also have a treaty with the Union government, engaging it to tackle Union programs in which Russia has an interest, and Russia will pay exactly what that work is worth to Russia. Relations between [as heard] other states and Union republics [must go] gradually from contract prices to world ones. I think that 100 days are...[sentence not completed].

But, of course, there is also work on the adoption in the same period of a number of laws connected with the presidency. My opinion is that it is correct to have elected the chairman of the Supreme Soviet now, but it is necessary, over a period of a year, to prepare laws connected with the transition to the presidential form of government of the republic and, in a year's time, to hold a nationwide, direct, secret ballot for the president of the republic from the alternative candidatures determined at the Russian Congress of People's Deputies.

[Salnykova] Correspondent Slanykova, from the oblast youth newspaper, TYUMENSKIY KOMSOMOLETS. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, our country fairly often gives material aid to countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Some statistics on this matter have recently been published. I should like to know whether Russian deputies will be able to look into the scale and necessity of that aid in the immediate future and maybe shut off the taps somewhere, so that our own people might benefit from those resources. Thank you.

[Yeltsin] I believe it is necessary now to bring under control the whole of the country's import and export program, which is connected with Russia. That is the first thing. The second is that it is necessary to analyze all debts or the share of debts owed by other states to the Russian Federation, and if those states are not yet able to pay them off, then we should propose that they pay them off, first and foremost, in consumer goods.

I favor reducing this assistance, especially to those states and countries which are managing to sell our raw materials for hard currency to other countries.

[Aide] Microphone one, please.

[Unidentified speaker] Igor....

[Helen Womack, interrupting] Please, it is impossible to take notes and ask a question at the same time. I also want to ask a question.

[Aide] Well, I think, we will give in to the lady. Please, go ahead. Let us make an exception for the lady.

[Helen Womack] I beg your pardon, please. This is Helen Womack from the London newspaper INDEPENDENT.

[Aide] Please, speak into the microphone, the broadcast is being relayed over the radio.

[Womack] If I could speak in English, please. If I could ask two questions in English [Womack speaks in English fading into superimposed Russian translation] First of all, do you want to lower the role of the Soviet Union? And, second, are you prepared to remove the blockade on Lithuania and to restore direct economic links with the Baltics?

[Yeltsin] As for relations...yes, translate the question into Russian, so that everybody can understand it.

[Unidentified speaker, presumably translator] How will the policy of the Soviet Union further evolve? Will it become a policy of development? And, how, what will the policy of the Soviet Union be toward the Baltic countries? [commotion in hall]

[Yeltsin] Well, let's...[commotion in hall]

[Womack in English, fading into superimposed Russian translation] I am sorry, but I do not know how to say it in Russian, but allow me to repeat it slowly. Your policy, the affirmation of the sovereignty of Russia, will your policy lead to the Soviet Union losing all meaning, that thus, Russia, as it were, will replace the Soviet Union? Do you understand the question? And the second question: What will your policy be toward the Baltic states?

[Yeltsin] I think we need to move away from the previous formula of everything for the sake of a strong center. Our state, country, union, will be strong only through strong republics and the stronger and the more independent the Union republics are, on the contrary, the stronger the center is, the stronger is our Union. Therefore, the sovereignty, the more, the independence of the Russian Federation, will lead exactly to the consolidation of the Union republics and to the desire to have to do not with a poverty-stricken Russia, but with a Russian with which it is really worth dealing.

With respect to the Baltic states, I think when the declaration of sovereignty and the relevant laws are adopted, then the Russian Federation will be one of the first to conclude treaties with namely the Baltic republics and there are already such, well, proposals today.

[Unidentified speaker] Go ahead, please.

[Yeltsin] That will also work toward strengthening our Union.

[Shkolnikov] I am Igor Shkolnikov from the TIKHOOKEANSKAYA ZVEZDA [PACIFIC STAR] newspaper, from Khabarovsk. Boris Nikolayevich, coming back once again to the issue of sovereignty. So, it is regarded as complete independence for Russia and the other republics. In this case, what role, in your view, is reserved for the country's president, will he be a coordinator or an executor?

[Yeltsin] There should not be senior or junion presidents. All presidents are equal. This is the first thing. The second thing is that state functions remain, and any republic, Russia in this case, delegates these functions as a share of power to the centre. The defense of the country will be within the competence of the Union, the center. State security is within the competence of the center, and a number of other such like [pauses] strategic elaboration of our social and political development, say, is a case for the center. The development and study of interethnic links between the Union republics is within the center's competence. Coordination in solving and implementing Union programs, in which Union republics will take part, is, again, within the competence of the center. In other words, the center will have a large share but, nevertheless, in relation to today's situation, it will be sharply narrowed and it will be directed, as it were, at the strategic planning of our country's development but not through the State Planning Committee.

[Aide] Microphone two, please. TASS.

[Aksenov] I am Aksenov of the TASS world service. Boris Nikolayevich, I have two questions. Do you intend to give up your functions as chairman of a Union Supreme Soviet committee and a member of the presidium? My second question is: How do you see the future of the RSFSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs? Speaking about Russia's foreign policy do you envision, for instance, the appearance of representatives of Russian diplomacy as part of Soviet embassies in the countries neighboring us for a start? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] I will of course be relinquishing my powers as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Construction. As regards membership of the presidium, the Presidium of the Union Supreme Soviet is not elected. You will recall it is made up of offices and all the chairmen of the Supreme Soviets of Union republics or presidents are members of it. I will therefore be a member of the presidium in my new post.

As for the second question regarding the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It does not, of course, mean our rather weak, in my view, Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs—which in the main signs exit visas—should now take over from the Union Ministry of Foreign Affairs what concerns the Russian Federation and graudally conduct this part of the work independently. To begin with there will probably be certain consulates and probably to begin with there will be certain groups within the embassies. It will not, of course, immediately mean the conclusion of treaties with all the 130-150 countries. It is a matter in the first stage of our neighbors, the countries of Europe and so on. However, the role of the Russia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs will significantly change in connection with the sovereignty of the Russian Federation.

[Aide] Microphone three, please.

[Koponpv] Vitaliy Koponov, from the newspaper LENINSKAYA PRAVDA, Khanty-Mansikysk Autonomous Okrug [national district]. Boris Nikolayevich, please say how you see the policy of the Supreme Soviet and government of Russia regarding the raw material, oil. Your ill-wishers are trying to claim you are planning to tackle problems by the very means of selling oil, as was the case before. One more question, accompanying that one and connected with it. Our oilmen are now continuing their labor dispute with the government. That is something you will inherit. In what form do you see a way out of this situation?

[Yeltsin] Well, I think there is a heavy legacy in all sectors. Therefore, the main thing in the first minutes after the election of the Supreme Soviet chairman was announced was probably not a feeling of joy, but a feeling of the enormous responsibility being laid on my shoulders in implementing a program, and a desire to do it in such a way that people can, all the same, have a better life, since tens of millions of people in Russia are living below the poverty line today, which is impermissible.

Regarding raw material, I have already said that in relations between republics within the country, if gas and semi-finished products are being sold for one-fifth or a one-quarter, and so on, of the world price, there must be a gradual transition from the contracat price to a world one; and we must define in contracts with republics what the period of that transition to world prices will be. I believe it will not be more than one year. That very thing will help us to solve the question of a mechanism for going over to the market without a drop in the population's standard of living. That is not the only way, but it is one of them. The region itself, as it goes over to financial autonomy and self-financing, will also possess these rights. In other words, it is not that, say, it is just the level of bureaucratism from the Union center, which will be reduced, while there will a high level of Russian bureaucratism—it is all the same thing to the person or the enterprise. This pyramid must really be turned over, turned on its hand. That is to say, the very lowest soviet, which is closest to the people, the rural soviet, the settlement soviet, the aul [as heard] soviet, the rayon soviet—it delegates a share of power to the following higher soviet: the oblast soviet, and the oblast soviet to the republican soviet, the republican soviet to the Union soviet. Only in that way, and not as before in the form of diktat: We dictate to you, you understand, the oil-men of Tyumen Oblast, for instance, or another oblast, that you are to assign 80 percent and the rest is not our business. No, this will not happen.

[Aide] Microphone number one, please.

[Dolganov] Vadm Dolganov, the Ukrainian newspaper KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA, Kiev. Boris Nikolayevich, you speak of the priority of the republican law over the all-Union one. In connection with this I have two questions. First, how will this be carried out if one takes into account that the composition of the RSFSR's people's deputies is more than heterogeneous? Second, what will your attitude be if, say, the parliament of the Ukraine takes the decision to ratify Union laws on the republics, territory before they [similar laws] come into force on the territory of the Ukraine? [brief silence]

[Yeltsin, in an aside to his aide] Something is not quite correct. [Aide appears to repeat the question]

[Dolganov, without microphone] I can repeat the question.

[Yeltsin] Somehow there is a lettle bit of (?reverberation) here. There is no microphone here, you understand?

[Dolganov] I can repeat the question. I can step back from the microphone and repeat the question.

[Yeltsin] Yes, not so loud, please, perhaps.

[Dolganov] Two questions, can you hear me now?

[Yeltsin] Yes.

[Dolganov] I have two questions in relations with what you have said about the republican law taking precedence over the all-Union law. The first question: How will this be implemented in Russia if one takes into account the fact that the composition of people's deputies is very heterogeneous? The second question: What will your reaction be if, say, the Ukraine adopts the decision ratifying all-Union laws before they come into effect on the territory of our republic?

[Yeltsin] Well, I think that, answering the second question, it is for the Ukraine to decide. It is up to the Ukraine to decide before or after, it is up to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet and the Ukrainian people. As regards Russian laws, I can repeat that they must take precedence over Union laws and, respectively, the same way from below, too: a decision made by an autonomous republic within the composition of the Russian Federation has priority. I am saying this again. Turn the pyramid over. This is where the whole meaning of power-forming and legislation priority or precedence lies. Of course, many contentious issues will arise here now, this is clear, but there will be constitutional committees which will examine these differences. We cannot always opt for confrontation. One should search for some approaches and compromises and opt for these compromises, by all means. But I think that, gradually, this mechanism will be developed. The most powerful soviet is the rayon soviet, and in the financial respect, too, it must be the strongest, the rayon soviet, for it is connected with the individual, his needs, problems and so on. It owns the land. It delegates the rest.

[Aide] Microphone two, please.

[Yeltsin] It is difficult, of course. Please do not link it to the Ukraine. I am saying this again that this matter... here, too, within the Russian Federation, different autonomous entities will adopt different laws, you see. One has to opt for it and to agree. We have had enough of that practice of imitation: If there is a Union law, then absolutely all laws are adopted as its precise carbon copies. The same is also true for the Constitution.

[Aide] Microphone number two.

[Yeltsin] In this republic, that is inside the RSFSR too, every autonomous republic will be adopting its own laws. You see, one must go along with and agree to this. We must stop copying the Union. As it adopts a law, then all other republics follow suit, one after another, adopting an absolutely exact replica of this law. The same procedure applies to the Constitution, too.

[Aide] Second microphone.

[Kiselev] I am Stephan Kiselev, from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, following your idea of the priority of republican laws, I would like to ask you this question: Do you not think that the steadfast development of the idea of the priority of republican laws places our Supreme Soviet—I mean the USSR Supreme Soviet—in a very strange, inconvenient, and ambiguous position. If, say, the USSR Supreme Soviet works out a press law, while the same press law can be adopted earlier by the Supreme Soviet of Russia, Lithuania, Georgia, the Ukraine, etc., then the USSR Supreme Soviet in this country becomes something like a Queen of England, who reigns, but alas, does not rule. Evidently in this connection, the ideas about an early recall of USSR people's deputies and a dissolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet recently have been expressed ever more frequently. This idea also was expressed here by Deputy Starovoytova in her speech. What is your comment on this? That is my question.

[Yeltsin] I understand you. First, it is necessary to coordinate in some way the time for adopting laws. The time for adopting laws must be coordinated. Regrettably, the congresses of people's deputies and the Union Supreme Soviet sessions have been adopting laws without any system and without determining in advance the order in which to adopt these laws. That is why our economic reform has choked and many other things are in disarray. It is necessary for both republics and the Union to determine in advance what laws they intend to adopt.

In relation to the two-level parliamentary system that is emerging, I would like to say that in principle I am also against the two levels, both in the Union and in Russia, but I believe that the present parliament in the RSFSR, since its 1,068—now 1,060—deputies have been elected, must work its five-year term in full.

[Korsarev] I am Vladimir Kosarev, from the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper. Boris Nikolayevich, your program touches on military matters, among others. I would like to find out in greater detail as to how you see the problems of the country's defense, especially those relating to military construction. My second question is connected with my first one: How do you, as the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman, intend to promote the resolution of these military issues, including the Army's social problems? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Some people are trying to accuse me of being in favor of republican armies. I wish to refute these accusations, since my program contains nothing of the sort. I am in favor of this country having one single army. Moreover, I am in favor of reform in the Army, as speedy a reform as possible. In other words, I think that it would be possible to implement reform in the Army this year. A lot has been worked out in this regard.

Further, what I have in mind is that those who out of some religious or other moral considerations cannot serve in the Army should be given some sort of alternative service: for instance, making some kind of items or goods, and so on. Well, this would also be an alternative form of service, to be served with the actual troops. Additionally, I am favor of more responsibility by local, city, rayon, city [as heard], oblast, and republican bodies for the maintenance of servicemen. I am in favor of introducing life insurance for servicemen and for the issue of cuts in armed forces being tackled simultaneously with the provision of work, housing, and social facilities, as a package. I am not in favor of these matters being addressed separately. And so on. Those are the main points.

[Nesrsta)] Czechoslovak TV correspondent (Vlastimil Nesrsta). Boris Nikolayevich, we all know there are big disagreements between you and Mikhail Gorbachev. What do you think, how will your relations develop? Are you ready to compromise? That is first. Second, behind you stands [a statue of] Lenin. Do you think that figure coincides with what is taking place at the First Congress of the Russian Federation?

[Yeltsin, after a 25-second pause] Yes, I do have disagreements with Gorbachev. I also had them three years ago, starting from 1987 on the tactics of perestroyka, on the approach to perestroyka, on questions of the role of the party, the CPSU, on questions of a multi-party system, on repeal of Article 6. I have had many. But gradually some of the issues have been falling away. They are being tackled: Article 6, a multi-party system, CPSU's monopoly of power. A number of questions still remain. I think relations with the president of the country must be businesslike, on the basis of dialogue, of talks, principled, not damaging to the sovereignty and problems of Russia. Everything personal that I have had and have, i cast away utterly.

Indeed, I have already been accused from across the ocean about socialism. Why did I not mention, why did I not pronounce socialism in my speech? Already from Canada.

I think the socialist nature, or the level and share of a society's socialist nature does not depend on the number of times the word socialism is pronounced. Over 73 years we have been saying it so much and there have been so many forms of it that now even the social scientists have becom confused and do not know what to call the society in which we live.

Second, there have been, and are, all sorts of socialism. There was simply socialism, there was developed socialism, there was socialism that had been built finally and irrevocably, there was Pol Pot's socialism, there was national socialism, there is the Swedish model of socialism. That is why the absence of the word socialism in my speech does not in any way show that I altogether reject this idea. We simply have to give it a different sense. That is the crux of the matter—a different sense, a different model. It will not depend on the name. The issue is that the people should have a good life in every respect, material, spiritual, so the people are free. That is the most important thing.

Now when they say capitalism I ask: What is it, where, what country has capitalism, tell me? Journalists say: The United States of America. Well, there has been no Marxian capitalism there for a long time, for a long time. Because the permanent impoverishment of the working people, about which Marx spoke, that it will be taking place under capitalism, they do not have it there. Marx said the market relations would be the undoing of capitalism. We do not see it dying. Consequently what kind of society they have there, capitalism, probably finished a long time ago. What kind of society is it? Presumably it is high time for our social scientists to name it or call it something.

[Mironov] KHRONIKA newspaper, Mironov. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, how do you assess the work of the present Moscow City Soviet and the new decisions adopted on the shops and food purchases by passport, the question of party buildings, and the media—the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA newspapers—and the proposal made at thee session that residents should elect their own major? What is your view?

[Yeltsin] What I am in favor of is this: If the president is to be elected by the people, the chairman of the oblast soviet should be elected by the people of the oblast, and the chairman of the city soviet by the people of the city. That is what I support. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet of an autonomous republic should be elected by the people of that autonomous republic. This chain should extend from the bottom to the top. Thus, the mayor of Moscow should be elected by Muscovites. This might be something of a future stage of the development of democracy, but we will get there all the same. As for my assessment of the work of the Moscow City Soviet, I would not be in any any rush to give assessments. Too little time has gone by. At the very least, I have been impressed by the novelty in their approach and the democracy in their conduct of sessions and adopion of decisions, and their glasnost. I support these developments.

As for the latest decision on selling food according to [residence] passport, can it be said that the leadership of the Moscow Soviet is guilty? The guilty ones are those who proclaimed to the whole country that prices will be raised. After all, this is not Poland, where prices are raised twice a month, and people have already become accustomed to it. In our country, people have become accustomed to the prices of the most essential foods being more or less stable that they are immediately infuriated by such a statement or such a program from the government about transferring to a market, involving price rises, even though there are alternative programs that guarantee moving toward a market without rises. That is the issue: proclaiming this for the whole country, without considering those alternative programs, and seven months before the start of the price rises. Talking already today about those that will go up, let us say, from, 1 January 1991. I believe it is, well, tantamount to suicide. How could it have been done? No, I think that perhaps only the elections at the republican congress have, perhaps, calmed people down somewhat. Otherwise, it seems to me that, after three, four, five days or a week, the people would have then proceeded to dictate its own will already from below.

[Sokolov] Sokolov, Mikhail, SOBESEDNIK. Boris Nikolayevich, as the leader of the Russian Federation, are you not worried by the growing during the last year of the anti-semitic, pogrom-like and fascist moods? What measures should the authorities adopt? What must be done to avert the mass exodus of the Jewish people from our country, which has begun?

[Yeltsin] I am worried by this process, worried. I think the absence of a Union law concerning political parties, public-political parties and public organizations facilitates, coincidentally, to a large extent, the unfolding, as it were, of this process. That is why we, the Russian parliament, must adopt a law of this kind. If the Union parliament has no wish to adopt it earlier this means it is us who have to adopt it and by this we would then be placing a barrier in the way of those organizations openly developing, as it were, already in some sort of fascist direction, you know, something that is perfectly impermissible. It is only through legislation, it is only, as it were, by way of the law, it is only by strengthening, as it were and carrying out a reform of the judiciary and the investigative processes—and it is my proposal that the investigations committee should be a single entity, a state, republican investigations committee comprising those from the KGB and the Ministry of Internal Affairs alike and that they should be merged so that it becomes a single committee, moreover not subordinate to the government, but subordinate to the Supreme Soviet—well, then we will somehow be able to—if not avert, then, at least lessen the illegality which currently is constantly practiced with regard to many of our citizens.

[Aide] I think we should already be thinking about finishing our press conference. There are still a few notes here. Therefore, I propose that this is what we do. Everybody at the microphone has one question, and a very short time [should be] spent on the notes.

[Yeltsin] I think that it would be possible to continue for another 30 minutes.

[Aide] Continue? Please. [indistinct voices in hall, applause]

[Aide] Please, microphone one.

[Matsenko] Microphone one?

[Aide] Microphone one.

[Matsenko] Is there a microphone, then?

[Aide] Yes, yes.

[Matsenko] Lyudmila Matsenko, Moscow Radio foreign broadcasting. My question is what place do you allot to China, the great neighbor of China, in the foreign policy of Russia?

[Yeltsin] I think that on the whole it is time for both the Union MID [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] and the leadership to turn their heads seriously to the East. All these years we have devoted ourselves very seriously to Europe, to relations with the United States of America, and certain others, while, Eastern problems, Eastern problems were obviously in the shade. And in our country, relations with our major eastern neighbors—China, Japan, Korea, and so forth, have been practically frozen and are at one and the same level. That is, all the problems of the APR—of the Asian and Pacific Ocean Region should now be more in the field of attention both of the Union, and as I have already said, of course, of the Russian leadership, too.

[Aide] Microphone two, please.

[Terekhev] Terekhev, INTERFAX. Boris Nikolayevich, could you tell us please, such an interpretation, eh, with what interpretation of Russian sovereignty is the center, that's to say, the Union administration acquainted? And, if it isn't, are you not afraid that that may give rise to a constitutional crisis between the center and another

Union republic? That's the first thing. And second, will you examine the program, the alternative program of the Interregional Group of Filshin on the transition to the market.

[Yeltsin] If the center quarrels with Russia, then there's no knowing what it's to lead. And the right of the Russian Federation to sovereignty, to self-determination, and to secede from the Union remains in the Constitution. I am not saying that Russia ought to secede, but the Union must constantly bear in mind that there is such a possibility. And it should not quarrel with Russia, but find some kind of common points of contact, find compromises, and I think that the Russian leadership will also strive to find where these compromises are, and not go out for confrontation, including with the president or with the government of the country.

With respect to the alternative economic prorgam proposed by People's Deputy Filshin, yes, it, as well, as the alternative program by Medvedev, people's deputy of Russia, and by comrade Niko, a major economist, will be examined, well, probably not at the congress, but at the session of the Supreme Soviet of Russia.

[Aide] Microphone three, please.

[Nikolayev] Yuriy Nikolayev, newspaper SOVETSKAYA TATARIYA. Boris Nikolayevich, Mikhail Sergeyevich is called the architect of perestroyka. Do you still feel yourself to be its clerk of works? And another question. The new Federation, is, really finally, really sovereign autonomy. How do you intend to avoid possible centrifugal forces? [indistinct voices]

[Yeltsin] Of course, as far as architect and clerk of works goes, well, I also would slightly depart from such stereotyped names, well. So far, things aren't going smoothly for the architect yet, or for the clerks of works either.

With respect to centrifugal forces, yes, of course, there is such a fear. But we have before us the sorry experience of the center, the Union leadership, constantly lagging behind in deciding questions connected with relations between the nationalities. It was said three years ago, let's, at the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Union, moreover, it was said when it was still the Moscow Group, before the Interregional Group, let's adopt laws, main laws, on the basis of which all the rest will be built later, a law on the national state system of the whole country. They did not adopt it. A law on the delimitation of functions between the center and the republics, with the maximum transfer of independence to the republic, to the republics, because, when the level of a person's democratization rises, and corespondingly, his national, his sense of national dignity, and all the remaining legislative functions have been left behind, that leads, well, to that rupture, and corespondingly, to those, so to speak, well, difficulties between the nationalities, and to that tension. Therefore, these centrifugal forces have to be anticipated in Russia, these laws have to be adopted among the first, so that here national autonomy, and all ethnic groups are [in existence] and do not feel themselves to be encroached upon but independent, economically, socially, nationally, and so forth. And then, through this, we will be able to avoid the tensions, which, in Russia, if that's not done, may be even stronger than in our inter-Union national centers of conflagration.

[Aide] MIcrophone one, go ahead, please.

[(Rosup)] (Yan Rosup), Estonian Television and Radio in Moscow. Boris Nikolayevich, what is your attitude toward the Baltic republics' striving to dissolve this forced marriage, that is to regain their state system, and how do you in such an event see the relations between a sovereign Russia and these states? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Straight to the second question. I have already spoken about this. I see the relations between Russia and the sovereign states of the Baltic republic [as heard] being based on agreements between Russia and each of the republics. An adress to the republics' parliaments should be adopted, and I think it might be adopted at the end of the congress, saying let us go for direct contacts, without setting any preliminary political or economic some sort of impediments or conditions. Without setting these, that is the most important thing.

In respect of how Estonia is to be with the center, so to speak, well, I equally in respect of Lithuanian, Latvia and Estonia, in respect of all three republics, I think there should be one approach. In respect of Lithuania I signed to Comrades Gorbachev and Landsbergis that they should not go for a head-on collision, should not fight their own people [as heard]. They should sit at a negotiating table. For the duration of these negotiations, the operation of the 11 March decree of Lithuania's Supreme council should be suspended, as should appropriately be the operation of the country's president's decrees on the economic blockade.

[Aide] Second microphone, please.

[Portnikov] MOLOD UKRAINY, Kiev, Vitaliy Portnikov. Boris Nikolayevich, I would like you to tell us in more details about the way the consitutional crisis in the Russian Federation itself can be avoided? In particular, what will be your attitude if the population of this or that autonomous republic would vote for its transformation in the Union republic? Are such elements possible? What kind of attitude will you, as the leader of Russia, have to it? What kind of guarantees are there for those people who do not have any national and territorial formations in the Russian Federation? These thoughts in general. And my second question, on foreign policy. Is Russia preparing to join us, the Ukraine and Belorussia, in the United Nations Organization? In conclusion, I would like to say that the Ukrainian parliament sent their greetings to you yesterday. Hence you became the first leader of another state, to which it sent its greetings. And this gives us hope that the relations between our countries will be good. Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Thank you. In respect to the ensuring of sovereignty, autonomy, creation of additional autonomies etc. A proposal, which I think was correctly perceived, had been made: The congress commission on national and state structure of Russia should be formed. And it should—being a group of prominent specialists: historians, demographers, economists etc—it should examine carefully every single region, the problems which exist there, what the republic wants, whether it wishes to change from an oblast republic to an autonomous republic, from an autonomous republic to a Union republic etc, that is to say to study all the range, or let's take Karachayevo-Cherkessk. Karachayev citizens want to be an independent and autonomous oblast, so to say, republic but not belonging to the Krasnodar kray, etc. There are very many questions like this. They have to be studied through. The commission together with all these autonomies should prepare its own proposal and it should be put forward for the Supreme Soviet and congress discussion, and then the congress has to resolve this issue.

[Unidentified speaker] What about joining the United Nations?

[Yeltsin] As for joining, or entry to, the United Nations, well, you know the history of this question. Stalin simply did not propose Russia. Evidently, he was rather afraid. And so three organizations, as it were, exist now—our state as a whole, the Ukraine, and Belorussia. I think that Russia must be inside the United Nations, but, bearing in mind that that will entail substantial expenditures, [it would be best] for the time being, to ask the United Nations to allow Russia to just have its own representative there. Later, when we are a little richer, we can raise the question of independent entry to the United Nations.

[Aide] First microphone, please.

[Ruben, in English, with superimposed Russian translation] I am Rudy Ruben, a Philadelphia inquirer of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI [as heard]. Boris Nikolayevich, could you expand on your views regarding the transition to a market economy? Do you support the idea of private ownership and disbanding the Gospaln [State Planning Committee] and Central Planning? And what about prices? Are you against their rise, or would you support it? And do you favor the idea of applying shock treatment, Polish style, to central planning?

[Yeltsin] The first thing is that I would like to correct myself as regards Korchevo-Cherkessk as it is, first, an autonomous oblast and, second, it is situated in Stavropol Kray, not in Krasnodar kray. That was a slip of the tongue.

As to private ownership and prices. I believe that whichever way you describe it, private ownership or citizens' personal ownership of the means of production can exist and have the right to existence just like all other forms of ownership, especially at small enterprises in the spheres of services and trade. That is what I mean by the equality of all forms of ownership.

The second is this. As regards prices [whispers to someone: As I was reading, I failed to catch what she asked about the prices; pauses] You see, we cannot possibly follow the Polish option as our conditions are not Polish. Poland has already transferred a long time ago to the market economy, albeit partially. In Poland, according to my information—perhaps, if I am wrong you could correct me—60 to 70 percent of all ownership is private. Therefore, our conditions are absolutely unique, and we cannot follow either the Polish or the Hungarian option, although one ought to borrow what is useful from these countries and from the countries of Western democracy. In particular, our parliament must learn from them.

As regards prices, I wish to say this again, there are alternative proposals for developing a mechanism for the transition to a market avoiding any major critical situations in society, in other words, avoiding sharp price rises to ensure at any rate the full social protection of low-wage earners.

[(Said)] I am (Said), KUNA. What will be the present position of Russia on the emigration of Jews to Israel and regarding the Israeli plan to settle them in the occupied Arab territories? And what is your attitude to the pogroms perpetrated by the Israeli occupation authorities in the occupied Palestinian territories? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Regarding the exit or entry of Jews in or from our country, the law on citizenship has been adopted and there are no barriers here. Regarding the fact that repressions are being carried out over there, I condemn them, of course. But how to solve the problem there is a matter for Arabs. Israel, Palestine, they should resolve the problem themselves. We should interfere less in these internal affairs, we burned our fingers too painfully when we interfered in the affairs of Eastern European countries.

[Aide] Microphone number three please.

[Alekseyev] Alekseyev of NOVOSTI Press Agency. If I have understood correctly, Boris Nikolayevich, henceforth all natural resources located on Russian territory belong to the Russian Federation. Does this mean that you will have an opportunity more actively to help, for instance, the resumption of supplies of oil and gas to Lithuania, and is an expansion of economic relations, direct economic relations, between the Russian Federation and the Baltic republics possible in the near future? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] I will perhaps answer you as I was answered by Thatcher in a conversation when I was in London for 20 hours recently. It was an interesting conversation, and when I asked her what she thought of a direct treaty between Russia and England, a sovereign, independent, really independent Russia having its own independent internal and foreign policy and the right to conclude treaties with other countries, taking into consideration our great traditions in this respect—indeed we were more than a century, more than two centuries ago selling grain, dairy herds, selling furs, copper, iron, and much else. She said, I'm for it, but first you become independent. That's how I answer you too. First, we must adopt a law on this sovereignty so the land, the subsoil, and so on really belong to Russia and only to Russia and all its formations, and correspondingly then there will come the conclusion of treaties with other republics including for the supply of oil, gas, and petroleum products. Not according to quotas allocated from the center. That will indeed be a transition to market relations. Perhaps at first, I say once more, not immediately at world prices, perhaps at first at some mutually-acceptable contractual ones.

[Hamdi 'Abd-al-Hafiz] Hamdi 'Abd-al Hafiz, journal ROSE AL-YUSUF Jiddah [as heard]. Many parliaments of the world have denounced the actions and crimes of Israel against the Palestinian people. Does this parliament plan to do so? What is your personal opinion and that of the Russian parliament? That is the first question. And the second one is: Between the people of Russia and the Arabs there have always been traditionally good relations. If Russia's sovereignty is restored, what will its relations with the Arab states be like? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] I have said that taking into account the fact that we ourselves are voluntarily taking on our shoulders a big additional burden from the shoulders of the center, then of course we will not be able to immediately have direct talks with all countries of the world. We shall no doubt start with our neighbors. As regards denunciation of Israel, I shall convey your worry to the deputies to the Congress of People's Deputies for their decision.

[Yegorov] Press center of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, Yegorov. Boris Nikolayevich, how do you conceive the Russian parliament's relations with the recently-formed Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia?

[Yeltsin] Cooperation on an equitable basis.

[Portuguese TV reporter] Boris Nikolayevich, please, for Portuguese TV. You were recently in Spain and you said you needed to learn the lessons of the transition from totalitarianism to democracy in Spain and Portugal. What are the main points that you would stress? Second question: In view of the situation which has taken shape now in the Soviet Union, do you advocate the dissolution of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Soviet Union, early elections, and also change of Government of the Soviet Union? Third, if you permit: Has Gorbachev congratulated you on your election, or have you sent him any caution that the delegation of the Soviet Union should defend certain rights of Russia at the talks with the United States? Thank you very much.

[Yeltsin] Regarding Portugal and Spain, the experience is really of very, very great interest and it needs to be studied, how from Franco's dictatorship in 1975, in 15 years the country has moved to a great deal of democracy, to a boom of economic activity and the corresponding results, to improvement in the living standard, improvement of the whole social sphere, virtual absence of any ethnic problems, and this boom, this very sharp rise in the economy and so on is still going on.

It needs to be studied and conversations should be had with the president, the general secretary, with ministers. I think much of interest could be taken on board by us in Russia, including transition to the market, although of course you did not switch to the market in 1975, you switched considerably earlier, you already had experience of that. But nevertheless Franco held in his hands a fairly big centralized power, including in the economy, and did not let it go. And your transition was not easy either, but nevertheless you changed by peaceful means, practically without a drop of blood, without civil war, from dictatorship to democratization, which is very important.

Regarding the Supreme Soviet of the Union, its dissolution. No, I was saying that such a two-tier parliament was out of place either in the Union or Russia, but doubtless it is a question of working through the deputies' term and then going on to a united system say, in Russia, of the Supreme Soviet, but with a bitter composition than today, of say, 400 or perhaps 500 persons.

In respect of the resignation of the Government of the Supreme Soviet of the Union [as heard]. Generally, five months ago when the government proposed one program at the congress, against which we spoke and against which 400 deputies voted, and even less than five months go by and suddenly it proposes another program, called radicalization of the economy, uh, of the economic reform and a transfer to the market with price rises, that is putting all these burdens on the people's shoulders, instead of trying to find what reserves we still have, then if you have initially made a mess of one program, you should resign and then a new government will present another program [sentence as heard].

Did Gorbachev congratulate me? I was congratulated by the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Lukyanov, and the chairmen of the chambers. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Union congratulated the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia. I have heard congratulations of another kind from Canada. [laughter in hall]

[(Woodrod)] David (Woodrod) of UPI. If you propose that the Union republics delegate their powers to the Union, then in principle it would seem necessary to temporarily dissolve the Union government and reestablish it. Perhaps that is not what you propose, but I would like to know in more detail how you see this transition period. Do you expect resistance from the Union government and President Gorbachev? Will Gorbachev be met on his return by a sovereign Russia on which he will no longer be able to have an influence?

[Yeltsin] In the next few days we will have cadre issues. But I will try to make use of your idea and perhaps first of all adopt a declaration of sovereignty, and then go on to the cadre questions so as to meet the president with the declaration already in my hands. As regards the Union government, I have already said that one program has really failed, although the government said it was the very best program and there was no other way out. Now one or two things have nevertheless been changed in it in fact, but all the same, it still envisages not only the most unpopular but simply impossible measures in the form of raising prices. The government should resign.

[Shchepotkin] IZVESTIYA newspaper, Shchepotkin, parliamentary observer. Boris Nikolayevich, well, first of all, I am not empowered to congratulate you on behalf of all the newspapers of the soviets, but you should believe that you have supporters there, and I congratulate you with your election too, let's put it, tomorrow, to the post of Russian president on my behalf and on their behalf.

[Yeltsin] Thank you, I believe so.

[Shchepotkin] And in this respect I have the following question: Are you not worried about the anti-Russian sentiments in the Union republics, which hint of more than even nationalism? And what is the Supreme Soviet under your leadership going to undertake to establish contacts with and to support compatriots outside the borders of the RSFSR? And my second brief question: In connection with the attitude which our people, as you know, have to private property, are you not worried about the possibility that the second part of the congress can use this attitude against the first part of the congress which supported you?

[Yeltsin] Well, I think, everything should be done in order to achieve the consolidation and not a split of the congress, because even the negligible superiority during the elections does not mean that the congress and the Supreme Soviet would not split up. And that is why everything should be done in order to just consolidate, and one of the forms which was found is the conciliation commission, which can facilitate a process, whereby these divisions between some groups of deputies, I mean, regions etc, become somehow dissolved. To my mind it was very optimistic when everyone became enthusiastic and rose to their feet on a single impulse, when a thousand deputies voted for the issue on sovereignty to be included in the agenda. And it looks like that is what should hold the deputies together—sovereignty, our common, so to say, aim of Russia, of its independence. Well, the first question. Anti-Russian sentiments, yes. They exist. I cannot provide all the remedies now, of course, a special commission is likely to deal with this issue. And probably we even have a thought on forming the special national committee, we have a thought to form, probably as an option as well, a sort of federal council of the representatives of all federations attached to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet for the discusison of all the ethnic issues, that is also as one of the options. Well, toward the Russians...anti-Russian moods, of course, exist. I think that first of all the law on refugees ought to be adopted. We somehow have to make it easier for them, and to find a way out of this situation, because there are a lot of Russian refugees from other republics. We have to find work for them, territory where they can live, privileged credit for the construction of the accomodation and of social and cultural facilities for them, and accordingly in the treaties with other republics it has to be envisaged that those republics have to compensate for everything the Russians invested there: their house or any other property which belongs to them.

[Aide] Third microphone, please. The last question.

[Davydov] IZVESTIYA newspaper, Davydov. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, right from the start of the congress we have been witnessing a sharp political struggle. A question in connection with this: In your view, the danger that measures taken by the new republican leadership will be sabotaged by those forces which only yesterday actively opposed your election—is this danger considerable?

[Yeltsin] You see, only yesterday they were actively against me and they even issued instructions to the effect that one should not vote for Yeltsin under any circumstances, but today I received respectful greetings from the Ministry of Defense [muted applause] along with some others. Hence the process will, nevertheless, proceed in the direction of consolidation, taking into account the fact that I firmly stated at the congress that I would support precisely this line—at least the main deputies' groups, territories, and autonomous formations should be present in and I mean represented on the leading bodies of the republic. Well, as for the work of the conciliation commission and deployment of staff, if we now agree to all the key posts being filled by the representatives of Democratic Russia, this means that we will simply be unable to begin our congress tomorrow. This, then, is the reason why this conciliation commission was at work: Staff is deployed in such a way that representatives of Democratic Russia and of the communists of Russia and of the agrarian sector and of the military and of economic managers and of the workers'-peasants' alliance and of those who do not belong to the party—I hope I have not omitted anyone—[indistinct prompting from the hall] and yes, of course of the autonomous formations, it goes without saying, yes, I think I have named all the main ones, or is there perhaps something else?

[Borisov] If you will allow me esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, do you not think that when Russia becomes independent it will become difficult for Moscow to combine the functions of Union and republican capital? Borisov, MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS.

[Yeltsin] Novgorod, Vladimir, Moscow—Moscow is the ancient capital of Russia. But where the capital of the Union is to be - let the center have a think here! [laughter]

[(Firyunin)] Another note: Dear Boris Nikolayevich, how do you intend to tackle the issue of the much-suffering Russian Church? Are you of the view that all the places of worship, monasteries and property—confiscated from the faithful—should be returned to them? This question is from (Vasiliy Firyunin) [word indistinct] correspondent.

[Yeltsin] My view is that the church should be a legal person. A law on freedom of conscience, to protect the rights of believers and their equality with atheists, so far not adopted at the Union forum, ought to be passed. I do not want to say that all of them should be handed back, because it may well be that they include things that do not need to be handed over and they would not be taken back, as it were, but, nonetheless, a majority [should be handed back], of course not all at once, because this will require certain investments for restoration, repair, and other work. The role of the church as part of our spiritual development and upbringing ought to grow.

[Haughy] A question from representative of TIME magazine, Paul Haughy; Boris Nikolayevich, your attitude to market relations. Are they needed? And if not, what do you propose?

[Yeltsin] I think I have already answered for market relations. They are needed. We have no other way of clambering out of this economic crisis, deadlock. The mechanism of transition to the market is another matter. So far the optimal ways have not been found by the Union government. They will be discussed also at a Russian level, the mechanism of transition to market relations.

[Aide] The next note is from (Viktor Kezbanenko) of SELSKAYA MOLODEZH [Rural Youth] magazine. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich! Traditionally, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Taking account of the contemporary conditions, will it [hierarchy] be infringed? Or will you return to the politburo?

[Yeltsin] No! I think that the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, and especially, the president, under a multiparty system, if the monopoly of the party on power is removed, ought to, while he is president, cease his membership of any party or public organization so as not to defend the interests of just one party. For him, the interests of the whole people are the main thing. The question will be resolved after the 28th congress.

[Aide] A note which I will read although it is unsigned: Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, the most difficult question: Are you ready to accept an invitation from Far Easterners to pay them a visit?

[Yeltsin] I have been to the Far East, true, not to the farthest, Komsomolosk-na-Amure was the last point so to speak. Unconditionally, I have previously accepted an invitation from the Far Easterners and I promised them I would go and visit them regardless of what post I might be in after the congress. So I repeat my agreement to visit the Far Easterners.

[Aide] Two last questions. Esteemed Boris Nikolayelvich, at college you took a course in resistance of materials, but where and from whom did you learn to overcome resistance of life's circumstances, where did you learn your endurance?

[Yeltsin] The persistence and stubbornness of the aministrative command system. That is what taught me it. [applause]

[Aide] And the second question from the same place: If children elected you president of a children's republic, what would your program of action be? Reveal the secret! This is a quesiton from PIONERSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper. There are also congratulations here on your victory, and "thank you".

[Yeltsin] I would at least try in each region to create children's republics. I mean Disneylands and so on and so forth. For our children, of course. I think this is very necessary but at the same time a program "Family and Children" will be adopted and this year a declaration on protection of children will be signed, in the year of the child, especially as in our country of course the level of mortality is one of the highest, being two or three times higher than in developed countries. In Japan it is 5.6 and in our country 21 per thousand.

Yeltsin Addresses Russian Komsomol Congress

LD3105193390 Moscow TASS in English 1843 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS special correspondents Galina Vinitskaya and Veronika Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The first congress of the Leninist Young Communist League [Komsomol] of the Russian Federation, which closed here today, elected Vladimir Yelagin as its first secretary.

Yelagin, 35, a mechanical engineer by training, had worked as first secretary of the Orenburg Regional Komsomol Committee in the Ural region.

Addressing the Russian Komsomol congress today, the new president of the Russian Federation's Supreme soviet, Boris Yeltsin, stressed that radical political and economic reforms were needed in this biggest constituent republic of the USSR.

"Small steps will not help, since the crisis has gripped the entire society," Yeltsin remarked.

The constituent congress of the Russian Democratic Socialist Association also drew to a close today. The independent political organisation was once a faction within the Russian Komsomol.

The association was founded by 60 out of the Russian Komsomol congress's 900 delegates. It adopted its own charter and platform.

Maxim Sotnikov, one of the association's leaders, told journalists that the association is not based on Marxism and favours "the break-up of the totalitarian system and the establishment of a society of parliamentary democracy, legality and a multi-party system."

The leader of the All-Union Komsomol organisation, Vladimir Zyukin, evaluated the creation of the Democratic Socialist Association as a manifestation of pluralism in the youth movement.

He expressed the Komsomol's readiness to provide financial and other material assistance to the new organisation.

Moscow Party Official Assesses Plenum Results

LD3105201890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The results of the plenum of the capital's CPSU City Committee which took place yesterday were discussed today by Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee. The plenum, he stressed, has effectively become the last major event before the city party conference and the 28th CPSU congress.

The results of the 23 rayon party conferences held so far show that most city communists speak against a split in the CPSU, and in favor of consensus and the consolidation of all healthy forces around the party center.

In reply to journalists' questions, the first secretary of the Moscow CPSU city committee said that in his opinion the election of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin as chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet reflects the dissatisfaction of the population and therefore of the deputies with the situation in the republic. One can only wish success to the new Russian leadership for the benefit of the citizens.

Comrade Prokofyev sees the opportunity to resolve the capital's acute problems in a constructive cooperation with the perestroyka forces, above all with the Mossovet [Moscow City Soviet] deputies. He also expressed hope for a just juridicial solution to controversial issues concerning party ownership and the city mass information media which were recently debated at the city soviet session. [video shows Prokofyev speaking at press conference]

Moscow Soviet Revokes Decision on Buildings

LD3105122390 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] A session of the Moscow City Soviet has revoked a decision adopted by the previous authorities on handing over a number of buildings to rayon committees of the CPSU and the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Youth Communist League]. The question of the mass news media was also considered at the session. The deputies elected at recent elections deemed it essential to establish newspapers, radio and television programs and other mass news media that reflect the position of the new Moscow City Soviet.

Russian Trade Unions Reject Government Reform

LD0106110190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] The Presidium of the Council of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia has made a statement expressing disagreement with the government's variant of the transition to a regulated market economy. It proposes to organize a constantly functioning round table to discuss the economic machinery and a set of measures for social protection in conditions of the transition with the participation of the government and the trade unions.

Vladimir Residents Protest Moscow Shopping Rules

LD0106130990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 1 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Muscovites are now one of the privileged classes; all others have lost the right, as you know, to shop in the capital. This has brought a mass of protests, including official protests. Some towns are threatening to stop delivering goods and foodstuffs to Moscow.

[Correspondent Vladimir Privezentsev, in street in Vladimir—identified by caption] I have here the latest edition of the Vladimir oblast newspaper PRIZYV, frontpaging the official telegram from Moscow Soviet Chairman Popov. Here is what he writes: The introduction of restrictions on food sales in Moscow to shoppers from other towns has brought a sharp adverse reaction among the people of Vladimir Oblast. [passage omitted]

[V.A. Kosyrev, deputy chairman of Vladimir Oblast Executive Committee—identified by caption] We think the Moscow Soviet has taken an ill-thought decision. On Sunday we sent a telegram to the Moscow Soviet, the Council of Ministers of the Union, and the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, asking for this decision to be lifted. Otherwise we will have to take retaliatory measures.

[Announcer] I add: Vladimir sends Moscow many industrial goods, foodstuffs, and liquor. The executive committee does not exclude the possibility of stopping the supplies. The example of Moscow and the general air of speculation in the country is causing other towns to take similar measures. Here's the latest reports: in Donetsk even rusks are handed out by the kilo when a [international] passport is shown.

To Suspend Food Shipments

PM0106140990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 May 90 Single Edition p 6

[Report by Ye. Sklyarov, correspondent of Vladimir Oblast newspaper PRIZYV, under general heading: "On the Deputies' Demand"]

[Text] Vladimir—Vladimir Oblast supplies approximately 17,000 tonnes of milk, 400 tonnes of cottage cheese, confectionery syrup, vegetables, potatoes, and other food to Moscow every day. In view of the capital's restriction on the sale of food to people from other cities, V. Kosarev, first deputy chairman of the oblast soviet executive committee, has sent a letter to the chairman of Vladimir Agro-Industrial Union [agropromsoyuz] demanding that these food supplies be suspended until all the circumstances are clarified.

A group of deputies from Vladimir City Soviet and G. Kondryukov, chairman of Vladimir Oblast Soviet, have sent telegrams to G. Popov, chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, pointing out that the decision adopted in Moscow was inadequately thought out. It provoked a negative reaction among the majority of the oblast's inhabitants. City soviet deputies are raising the question of equal per capita distribution of food and manufactured goods stocks among the whole population, including Moscow.

Report on Kamchatka Oblast Party Meeting

PM0106132590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent A. Androshin: "Plenum Held"]

[Text] Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy, 20 May—A Kamchatka Oblast CPSU Committee [obkom] plenum was held today. An organizational question was considered among others. The plenum discussed obkom first secretary P.P. Zinovyev's request to be relieved of his post in connection with his recent election as chairman of Kamchatka Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. P.P. Zinovyev had previously voiced in public on several occasions his negative attitude to combining the aforementioned posts. The plenum's participants decided to postpone the election of a party obkom first secretary until the report and election oblast party conference. V.Ya. Abayev, CPSU obkom second secretary, has been temporarily charged with these duties.

The plenum heard a report regarding Kamchatka representatives' participation in the work of the recent initiative congress in Leningrad to form a Russian Communist Party within the CPSU. The plenum's participants were unanimous in advocating the creation of a Russian Communist Party within the framework of the CPSU and the organizational formation of this party at the Russian party conference 19 June 1990 in Moscow.

Yazov Addresses Khabarovsk Conference

OW0106075390 Khabarovsk Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 30 May 90

[Excerpts] The 27th Party Conference of the Red Banner Far East Military District was held today in Khabarovsk. An hour ago, in the district's House of Soviet Army Officers, the results of the election of delegates to the 28th Congress of the CPSU were tallied. Our correspondent Lev Vinegorodskiy attended. He reports:

[Begin recording] [Vinegorodskiy] The conference heard the Far East Military District Political Directorate's report on perestroyka, renewal, and the activities of party organizations' political organs, delivered by Lieutenant General Aleksandr Ivanovich Voronin, head of the district's political directorate, and defined the current tasks facing communists. The Secretary of the District Political Directorate's Party Commission, Colonel Fedor Vasilyevich Malev, reported on work completed from December 1988 to May 1990. Conference participants also summed up the results of discussions of the draft platform of the CPSU for the 28th Party Conference and the party statutes. [passage omitted]

Minister of Defense and Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov was among the candidates for delegate to the congress. Speaking from the conference rostrum, he said in particular:

[Yazov] The CPSU Central Committee's letter, the party platform and the new party statutes are now being widely discussed in party organizations. There are different opinions about them. These diverse opinions were also expressed by you today. It is important that these precongress documents and discussions become the basis for uniting our ranks and for boosting the role and prestige of party organizations in labor and military collectives.

We know that an absolute majority of Far Eastern communists firmly support the position of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, correctly understand, and appraise, the role and tasks of the party at this stage, and have determined their role in implementing them. It is all the more important considering that the restructuring processes in society, the party, and the armed forces are developing only with difficulty and frequently in a contradictory manner. It should be said that a majority of your district's personnel, primarily communists, correctly understand their tasks and are responsibly fulfilling their duty as soldiers. The district as a whole achieved positive results during the winter training period. Operational combat training plans have in general been fulfilled. Experience in using automated troop control systems in planning combat operations and managing troops is being perfected.

But today, it can be legitimately noted that an entire range of troop training tasks is still being poorly dealt with. This can be seen from the questions you asked me yesterday. It is also evident in today's presentations at this party conference. [words indistinct] of formalism and the stereotyped operational training of generals, officers, and administrative organs. The professional education of a significant portion of commanders and political workers remains at a low level. Many communists have but a superficial knowledge of the tasks of the operational mission of subordinate formations and units. The level of combat training of a majority of subunits, units, and formations remains no better than satisfactory, besides which, this has now become the norm. Many do not even think about achieving a better evaluation. As in the past, difficult, unresolved problems remain in the area of strengthening military discipline.

With today's conference, the accountability and election campaign in the district draws to a close. It has also entered the final stretch in the armed forces in general. A distinctive feature of the precongressional accountability and election campaign in the Army and Navy is the incisiveness of political assessments of the state of affairs in society, the party, and the armed forces. You no doubt sensed this by the criticism expressed in the delegates' presentations. This criticism was fully justified regardless of whether it was addressed personally to the minister of defense, to the [words indistinct], or to the entire leadership of the armed forces. We accept this criticism and consider it as concern for the prestige of both the armed forces and the leadership. [end recording]

Local Bodies of Power Elected in Maritime Kray

LD3106202290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 31 May 90

[Summary] It took a month for the deputies of a new convocation in the Maritime Kray to form bodies of kray power. Volyntsev, first secretary of the Kray Party Committee, was elected chairman of the Soviet. Kuznetsov, a 36-year-old scientist, was elected chairman of the Kray Executive Committee. He is the deputy director of the Institute for Economic and International Problems of Ocean Exploration of the Far Eastern Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

New commissions have been formed which reflect the kray's specific features: on defense issues and social protection for servicmen, on human rights and social justice.

Western Republics

State Commission Discusses Donbass Strike Accord

LD3105173690 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Donetsk May 31 TASS—A government commission, set up to monitor the implementation of agreements reached during last summer's Soviet miners strike and led by Deputy Prime Minister Lev Ryabev, held its first meeting in Donetsk today. It was attended by representatives of the union ministries, the Ukrainian government and the Donetsk strike committee.

The meeting assessed the implementation of a joint protocol signed last July by the commission members and the leaders of the striking Donbass miners. Special working groups, consisting of ministerial experts and representatives of the strike committee, were set up to settle disputes that will arise during the current discussion.

The commission today set out on a tour of Donbass mining towns. Its members will meet the strike committees of mining associations and check the implementation of the government resolution.

The final meeting of representatives of all mining associations, trade union leaders, members of the strike committees and the government commission, as well as the chairmen of the local soviets of people's deputies is scheduled for the end of the week.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Recognizes Lithuania

LD3105183890 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Kishinev May 31 TASS—The Moldavian Supreme Soviet recognized the independent Republic of Lithuania at its session here today.

Moldavian parliamentarians favoured the establishment of direct diplomatic, economic, political and cultural ties with Lithuania.

The Moldavian legislature proposed the Lithuanian Parliament to exchange permanent missions.

People's deputies grouped in the "Soviet Moldavia" alliance opposed the decision. They disagree, specifically, with the wording "diplomatic ties". In their opinion, such relations cannot be established between republics that are parts of a single union state.

Members of the group were not fully represented at the session today. A large part of deputies from towns with a predominantly Russian-speaking population have not attended parliamentary sittings since May 22.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Debates Ministries

LD3105175390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 31 May 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tamas]

[Text] Kishinev, 31 May (TASS)—The session of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet continued its work today. At the start of the sitting the deputies heard information on the consequences of the earthquake in the republic and the prompt measures being taken to eliminate them.

Afterwards the deputies went on to a discussion of the draft law "On the Government of the Republic." Mircha Druk, the new head of the Moldavian Government, proposed a new structure. The draft law proposes to leave 15 new ministries in place of the over 40 ministries and departments that have existed till now.

They include a Ministry of National Economy, a Ministry of Information, Information Technology and Communications, a Ministry of Culture and Religious Denominations [Ministerstvo Natsionalnoy Ekonomiki, Ministerstvo Informatsii, Informatiki i Svyazi, Ministerstvo Kultury i kultov], and a number of others which will, within the new government structure, perform important and sizeable functions connected with the transition to a market economy. Their main task, as deputies see it, will be to elaborate the strategy and tactics for getting all sectors of the Moldavian national economy out of crisis.

A proposal by a number of deputies for the creation of a Ministry of Internal Affairs and Military Issues [Ministerstvo Vnutrennikh del i Voyennykh Voprosov] was not received unequivocally by the members of parliament. However during the vote most deputies expressed themselves only in favor of approving a Ministry of Internal Affairs. As regards military issues the deputies inclined to the view that this is the prerogative of the USSR and the Government should take part in tackling them in conjunction with the superior union bodies.

For the first time a Ministry of State Security [Ministerstvo Gosydarstvennoy Bezopasnosti] has been created within the government structure. The newly formed ministry has functions that differ from those of the existing republican committee of state security. The prerogative of the committee is to care for the security of the Soviet Union, while the ministry that has been set up is to care for the security of the Moldavian State.

The structure of the Government, comprising 17 ministries, was approved as a result of the debate.

A recess to 4 June has been announced in the work of the parliament in connection with the need to organize work locally to overcome the consequences of the earthquake.

Second Quake Kills Four People in Moldavia

LD3105163390 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Kishinev May 31 TASS—A new underground tremor rocked Moldavia at 04:19 Moscow time today. The tremors lasted 15 seconds. The Kishinev seismic station said the quake in the Moldavian capital was four to five points, and up to four points on the 12-point scale in southern Moldavia.

The government commission on emergencies met here today to review measures to eliminate the consequences of the earthquakes. According to provisional data, nearly 600 people were affected in the republic, and more than 30 were hospitalised. Four people died.

The economic damage is now being assessed. But provisional information indicates that significant damage was inflicted on some 40 schools, 42 day care centres, 36 medical establishments, and a number of industrial and agricultural facilities. In Kishinev, some 1,000 flats need emergency repairs and 340 flats are being evacuated.

Worst hit were the southern regions of the republic, including cities Komrat, Chadyr-Lunga and Kakhul.